00067306

00067306

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 11 March, 2020

A STUDY OF CALVIN

AND OTHER PAPERS

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA · MADRAS
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
DALLAS · SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

A STUDY OF CALVIN

AND OTHER PAPERS

BY

ALLAN MENZIES

LATE PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS

WITH A MEMOIR BY HIS DAUGHTER

67306
6c

PREFACE BY SIR HENRY JONES

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1918

COPYRIGHT

GLASGOW: PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY ROBERT MACLEHOSE AND CO. LTD.

PREFACE

Not long after her Father's death, Miss Menzies asked me to write his Memoir. It was to be short and to introduce a volume containing his nearly finished book on Calvin, and other writings.

It was not possible to refuse the request. It was an appeal from a great loss, and it implied a trust that was sacred. The character of Dr. Menzies seemed to me extraordinarily perfect; and I was very fond of him. His ways were wise and gentle, and his life was peaceful and happy: I thought it not well that men should forget him or not know him. But on the other hand, though our friendship was intimate our opportunities of meeting were relatively few, and he rarely spoke of the events of his life or of himself at all. And he was one of those simple great men whom it is easier to love than to describe and whom 'only the good are worthy even to praise.'

I asked Miss Menzies to collect the material and to set forth the facts of his life just as they presented themselves and appealed to her. My task was to follow. It was very light. It was hardly more than to let the portrait she had drawn stand untouched and to introduce the book to the reader. For I found in the narrative that sincerity and frankness and that simple trust in the subject

which lets it speak for itself and which can come only when it has modelled the mind which writes and filled it with reverence. Dr. Menzies had a way of saying things and letting them stand on their merits without comment or commendation. There was no obscurity of mind, no blurred edge to his thoughts. I think I am not wrong in finding the same qualities in his daughter's Memoir of him.

His life was crystal clear and had the pre-eminent prosperity of the scholar's career. With the best of blood in his veins, for he was sprung from a long line of honourable men and devout women whose days had been a blessing to their times: one of the many children of a widowed mother, splendid in her courage and cheerfulness and devotion: educated among wholesome influences and trained for a profession whose concern is to serve the greatest of all causes—what better career can a man have than that of proving worthy all his life long of such an inheritance and upbringing? He was happy in his home, amongst his neighbours and in his work, and he went about his quiet affairs adorned with the beauty of peace and simplicity, a shrewd and kindly observer of the ways of men, and their inevitable help.

These are the kind of lives which, it seems to me, stand worthiest of record and are to be valued as a possession for ever. And the record is the better if it is simple and sincere.

Miss Menzies desires to express something of her gratitude to Professor Moffatt and Professor Main for all

they have done in selecting and arranging and revising her Father's writings, and in completing the "Calvin" so far as that was possible. Others also have her gratitude. She has accepted their kindness the more unreservedly because she knows that it was inspired by their regard for her Father's scholarly life and their loyal care for his memory.

HENRY JONES.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

CONTENTS

PART I

MEMOIR

PAGE

I. Parentage and Youth - - - - - - 1

II. The Ministry - - - - - - - - 19

III. The St. Andrews Years - - - - - - 45

PART II

A STUDY OF CALVIN AND CALVINISM

Note by Professor James Moffatt - - - - 123

I. The Career and Personality of Calvin - - 127

II. Calvin's Teaching

I. Calvin as a Biblical Critic and Interpreter - 194

II. Calvin as a Theologian: 'The Institutes' - 210

III. The Influence of Calvin - - - - - 230

IV. The Permanent Message of Calvinism - - 242

PART III

COLLECTED WRITINGS

PAGE

I. The Call of the Church to the Nations - 251

II. Pauline Studies

I. The Preparation of the Apostle Paul at Tarsus 265

II. St. Paul's View of the Divinity of Christ - 286

III. Christological Studies

I. The Art of the Parables - - - - 320

II. The Essence of Christianity - - - - 332

III. The Social Office of Religion - - - 367

IV. Sermons and Prayers written for the Services of the University Chapel, St. Andrews - 389

ILLUSTRATIONS

The College Hall Group, 1862-63 - - - - 12

St. Mary's College from the South-East - - 45

PART I

MEMOIR

Memoir

I

PARENTAGE AND YOUTH

ALLAN MENZIES was born at 32 Queen Street, Edinburgh, on the 23rd January, 1845. He was the third son of Allan Menzies, Professor of Conveyancing in the University of Edinburgh from 1847 till 1856, and of Helen Cowan, daughter of Alexander Cowan of Valleyfield, Penicuick.

His paternal grandfather was the Rev. William Menzies, who was for more than fifty years minister of Lanark—from 1793 till his death in 1848. His parish, when he entered upon its charge, had a population of some 4000, which was doubled after the New Lanark Cotton Mills were erected. There thus arose the need of another place of worship, and it was by the exertions of Mr. Menzies in great part that the Church of St. Leonard was built.

The story of the family life at Lanark Manse is typical of that of many Scottish manses of those days. The stipend was small—at lowest about £90, and at its highest not £190. But the minister farmed his own glebe, and with the help of his wife found in his narrow means enough to bring up a family of eleven children, of whom six were sons who all entered the learned professions. Mr. Menzies shrank from no toil in the

interests of his people. He preached three times on Sunday, and every Saturday afternoon he might be seen on the Lanark race-course committing the morrow's carefully-written sermons to memory.

The most interesting and possibly in some ways the most disquieting of his parishioners was Robert Owen, the Welsh reformer and philanthropist, who was for some years the manager of the New Lanark Cotton Mills. We know nothing, unfortunately, of the private relations between Robert Owen and Mr. Menzies, but we find that in 1822 there was a violent controversy between Robert Owen and the Presbytery of Lanark, on account of the alleged lack of religious instruction in his schools, and that William Menzies, as Clerk of Presbytery, was a member of the deputation sent to enquire into the state of affairs. It appears that Owen never had the least intention of prohibiting the reading of Scriptures in his schools. But he objected to and forbade burdening the minds of young children with committing the Shorter Catechism to memory. Robert Owen was, in fact, a deeply religious man, and as he found the theological creeds of his time as hard and narrow as its economic conditions, he was naturally regarded with profound distrust by both sacred and secular powers. The controversy seems to have gone on without any appearance of result till Robert Owen left Lanark. A word of Dr. Thomas Chalmers, who stayed several times at the Manse, makes it probable that in more favourable times Robert Owen and William Menzies might have been conscious that they were serving the same good cause: "His Manse," said Dr. Chalmers, "is the most like what a Manse should be of any I was ever in: his prayer breathing so much of the priest, the patriot, the father and the friend."

One of the sons of Lanark Manse, Robert Menzies, became minister of Hoddam, and was a well-known scholar of the old school. He had studied for several years in Germany, and brought home with him a large library of the works of the foremost German theologians and a thorough knowledge of the German language and German methods of study. He was offered the Moderatorship of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and invited to accept the Chair of Biblical Criticism in the University of St. Andrews, afterwards occupied by his nephew, the subject of this Memoir. In later years the worthy minister was much distressed when some of his nephew's writings, which he regarded as unsound and even heterodox, were attributed to him.

Allan Menzies, the third son of the Manse, father of the future St. Andrews Professor, was born in 1805. He also had the scholar's temperament, and distinguished himself both at school and College. He was apprenticed to a lawyer in Edinburgh, with whom he 'led a most laborious life.' In 1833 he was appointed Clerk to the Dick Bequest Trust, which was founded for "elevating the character and position of the parochial schools and schoolmasters in the counties of Aberdeen, Banff and Moray"; in virtue of his office he visited the schools in these counties, and in examining them had many amusing experiences.

In the same year he married Helen Cowan, daughter of Alexander Cowan of Valleyfield, Penicuick. Mr. Cowan had received part of his education in Germany, a thing which in those days was unusual, and which was not without its bearing upon my Father's own education.

Helen Cowan gives us an account of her parents in a spirited set of *Family Memorials* which she wrote down for her descendants. "I have seen an old journal of

my Mother's," she writes, "in which she says that her life was like 'a fairy tale on a summer's day.' Nature had endowed her with considerable powers of mind, and under my Father's superintendence these were well cultivated. (She was only nineteen years old when she was married: her husband twenty-five.) She made herself an excellent French scholar, knew something of Italian and was a capital arithmetician. She used to occupy all her odd moments in learning something, and acquired a tolerable knowledge of German in this way. My Father taught her Mathematics and some of the higher branches of arithmetic, also chemistry, and they read a good deal together." Robert Menzies of Hoddom, describing a chance visit he paid to Valleyfield, says: "I shall not soon forget the impression made upon my mind by the sight of your Father and Mother sitting together in his study and employed in reading with the assistance of the latest critical annotators, the Greek New Testament."

In 1811 Alexander Cowan, who had succeeded to the firm of papermakers founded by his father in 1770, sold the Valleyfield Mills and his mansion-house to the government, who adapted them for occupation by French prisoners of war. Writing in the same year, Charles Cowan, Helen's eldest brother, speaks of the miserable condition of trade, and how at the same time prisoners of war "were being brought home in hundreds or thousands, which induced the Government to provide buildings for the reception of the captives. . . . Several new prisons were added to the then existing buildings at Valleyfield, which, when completed and fully occupied, contained upwards of 5000 inmates. . . . The old mansion-house was in a great measure rebuilt and converted into a hospital for the sick and wounded, who had a separate airing ground for them-

selves. Well do I remember their grotesque appearance, enveloped as they were in long capacious bright yellow dressing-gowns, with caps to match. (There are still various carved wooden articles in the family that were made by the prisoners at that time.) I witnessed the departure and joy of the prisoners when they were marched out of the prisons after the peace of 1814. The prisons remained unoccupied until 1820, when they were repurchased by my Father and Uncle for, I think, £2200, after they had been exposed repeatedly for sale by tender and auction."

This same brother, Charles Cowan—for many years Liberal M.P. for Edinburgh—remembered being present as a boy when a small company of friends "met to hear a work read from the proof-sheets, the first of a series, which at once elicited the most unbounded admiration in both hemispheres. . . . *Waverley* or *'Tis Sixty Years since*."

Alexander Cowan, the father, had much intercourse with Sir Walter Scott, and was appointed one of his trustees; his son Charles had charge of the manuscripts of the Waverley novels for about a fortnight in London when they were sent up to be sold in the year 1828 (or 1829). Another link with that circle was that Lucy Cowan, daughter of Alexander and sister of Helen, married Thomas Constable, son of Archibald Constable, the friend and publisher of Sir Walter Scott.

In the *Family Memorials* already mentioned, Helen Cowan writes a few stories about her Aunt, Mrs. Chalmers, the mother of Thomas Chalmers. "Her son's popularity did not elate her, but she knew and felt his high moral worth, which to her—as in itself—was of far more value. On one occasion I brought her the character of her son in *Peter's Letters* to read. She

looked at the portrait, saying, "That's no like Tammas," and then proceeded to read what was said of him. When she came to 'a leonine expression of countenance,' she said, "They have a heap o' new fangled words noo."

The chief characteristic of Helen Cowan's home life was its happiness, "everybody was happy in it—a full unchecked happiness, reaching even to the stranger within the gates." And this happiness was reflected all through the life of her who was the mother of the future Professor at St. Andrews.

Allan Menzies was her third son. From the nursery at 32 Queen Street, Edinburgh, which was at the very top of the house and had two storm windows, he and his two elder brothers and four little sisters could look out over all the town to the Firth of Forth and watch the ships sailing past Inchkeith. The first summer of young Allan's life, the family went to Burntisland, and the six months' old baby used to be taken to the rocks by his nurse and lie supported by her hands in the salt water, an element in which he afterwards became so much at home. His mother was a good swimmer, and took her two big boys and all her girls out with her and taught them to swim.

In the year 1851 the family removed from Queen Street to Murrayfield House. Allan was 'a clever boy, full of restless energy and sometimes rather mischievous.' He was sent to the Circus Place School, while his cousin, who lived in the house, had charge of seeing that his home lessons were learnt. The walk to the school was long for a little lad of six years, and he felt the loneliness. But he made friends with the old man who kept the toll-box on the Ravelston Road, and used to tell him what he had been learning. On one occasion he was found explaining to him the difference between *inherent* and *external* beauty.

The younger children saw little of their father. He had been appointed Professor of Conveyancing in the University of Edinburgh, and, in addition to the duties of his Chair, he had a large legal practice. Coming home tired in the evenings, he was unable to cope with the eager restlessness of his three younger sons, but he was always courtly and tender to his daughters. He was never robust in health, and he died when Allan was only eleven years old, leaving the mother with slender means to educate her five sons and four daughters.

But she had a brave, fearless spirit, a determination to win through and to make the best of everything. Tall and handsome in figure, fresh and active in mind, knowing little of convention and caring less, she saw that the best thing she could do for her children was to give them a good education, and she had heard from her father of the sound German methods and the possibilities of frugal living there. And so with splendid courage she set out for Germany with her seven younger children, a year after her husband's death, not knowing the language and having no friends there.

They lived first at Cannstadt, on the outskirts of Stuttgart, and in order that the boys might be in some measure prepared for entering the *Gymnasium* and taking their places among the German boys, they were boarded during the summer months with a teacher in Stuttgart. In the autumn the family removed to a flat in the Neckarstrasse of Stuttgart, and the boys went to the *Gymnasium* daily at 8 a.m. There they learnt their Greek and Latin through German, and worked well under the careful German system; they acquired a thorough knowledge of German and of the local dialect, *Schwäbisch*, which they never forgot and always delighted to speak in after years.

Allan is reported at that time to be "coming on well, very studious and diligent." He enjoyed his school life, but often found time for mischief at home, which resulted sometimes in a call from the landlord, requesting that not so many books, balls and other articles might find their way to the *étage* below. On one occasion two ladies walked up to the third floor to show with indignation the effect of a squirt on their new bonnets.

There were a great many English and American boys at Stuttgart in those days, sons of the widows of professional men or retired army officers, who had gone to Germany for the cheaper and more thorough education. The German and English boys got on pretty well together, but there were occasional big fights. In winter, when the snow was on the ground the fights were sometimes sanguinary; the material was ready at hand, and to the mind of the German boys a snowball with a stone in the middle of it was a very effective missile. Allan took no part in these fights; he attempted the rôle of mediator without success, and returned one day with an ugly cut on his lip.

The boys enjoyed the swimming baths on the Neckar, and became strong and expert swimmers, so much so that when in July 1859, the family spent some weeks at Brunnen, on the Lake of Lucerne, Allan and his younger brother Robert swam across the lake to the Schillerstein. One day the whole party set out from Brunnen to ascend the Frohn Alp. "We younger ones," wrote one of the sisters, "soon outstripped our Mother, whom we left to come prudently up with the little guide, a very Greatheart for strength and perseverance. We found in the end, however, that prudence and a guide were no bad things, for while we went rushing on, climbing every peak we came to, in the expectation of reaching the top, and thus

exhausting our bodies and discouraging our minds, our Mother came up more slowly and surely on evener ground and at last sat waiting for us at a Senner's hut. What a brave active Mother she was! What an example of perseverance and ambition she set us! Some of us had lost a good deal of our freshness and ardour already, but we toiled on, resolved not to be outdone by our middle-aged Mother. We were rewarded at the top by a most splendid view, the lake of Lucerne formed a beautiful foreground; nine other lakes shone in the distance, and there were glaciers innumerable. Our Mother sat down on the brow of the hill and tried to make herself cool by gazing on the distant glaciers; we tried it too, but finding it of no use, ran down into a hollow where there was a considerable sheet of snow. We put lumps of snow inside our hats to keep our heads cool, and about two o'clock set out on the grand descent."

At Brunnen the Mother used to gather her flock around her on Sunday afternoons to read them some improving book. The little group sat down on the hillside or at the edge of the lake, and the Mother soon became immersed in the book she was reading. On looking up she found herself alone; her audience had crept silently away to follow their own pursuits.

It was from Stuttgart that Allan Menzies and his brother Robert went for a walking tour with their uncle, George Cowan. There is a youthful paper about this excursion and especially about the crossing of the Grand St. Bernard.

Writing of Aosta, where the Pass begins, Allan says, "My recollections of this town are very melancholy. My unspeakables, being of black cloth and having seen some service, needed a new piece of cloth to mend them-

selves, to get which I sent my companions from the hotel into the town. They soon returned, bearing in triumph a trophy to themselves indeed pleasing, but to me bringing much sorrow—a piece of glazed calico, whose only similarity with what it was to supplement was in colour—it was black. In the insertion of a piece of it into the old garment much midnight oil was consumed, and the result was a shining black circle in the midst of darkness." After describing a tour of inspection over the monastery and its grounds, he goes on, "It was all very pleasant, the monks were kind and conversational, the weather was perfect, the dogs were very fine. But never does 'joy unmixed and without thorn the rose' fall to the lot of man. Loud whispers and stifled laughter behind me made me aware that my weak point, my black calico circle, which all day I had been anxiously trying to conceal from the eye of man, had been discovered, and all evening I furnished amusement to the younger brothers of that amiable fraternity."

In 1860 the family returned to Edinburgh, and took up house at 7 Manor Place. Not being accustomed in Germany to plumber work, Allan's curiosity led him to make an incision in the water-pipe in his room and to blow down the gas-pipe, just to see what would happen.

"The summer of 1860 was spent at Arran, where the boys had a boat of their own and spent all their time in or on the water. An attempt to sail round the island resulted in their being cast ashore at Loch Ranza, where they had to abandon the sorely battered *Betsey* and walk back in sorrow to Lamlash."

In the autumn the boys went to the Edinburgh Academy, where their German schooling enabled them to take good places—Allan was at the end of his first year best in his class for Latin prose. He used to get into

trouble for inattention, no one realising that he was already suffering from deafness—a trouble which increased with years and to some extent shut him off from his fellows, though it was powerless to cast the slightest shadow on his life. He always said, in his unselfish way, that it was more a trial to the people he lived with than to himself, and he would insist, with a twinkle in his eye, that he was fully aware of its advantages. It may have been partly owing to his deafness that he possessed in such marked degree the power of retiring to that pure and lofty atmosphere in which he lived, an atmosphere, the calm serenity of which petty troubles and irritations seemed powerless to disturb. A recent article in the *Spectator*, entitled "A Modern Saint," might well have been written about my Father, so perfectly does it describe him.

"A slight deafness . . . did not seem to incommode him, although it contributed no doubt to a certain detachment—a quality which might be described as the only selfishness of the Saints. The little defect added a pathos to his address, and gave him an air of asking a favour when he asked a question. He had another advantage which most Saints are called on to do without—a sense of humour. . . ." As one of his friends said of him, there was a ripple of sunshine and of fun running through his life; he had indeed the freedom of spirit that could play with words, with things and with people, and never a touch of ridicule to make one misunderstand the deep undercurrent.

On leaving school in 1862, Allan Menzies went to St. Andrews University, where he took his Arts course and his M.A. degree. He lived for a time at the College Hall, where among his fellow-students was Andrew Lang. My

Father wrote a brief account of *Andrew Lang as a Student* for *College Echoes*, from which we may quote a few lines.

"One of the last letters I wrote to him (Andrew Lang) spoke of the death of one of our College companions. 'Time for us to go,' was his reply—and he has gone. We were fellow-pupils in the Edinburgh Academy before we went to College, members of a Class of ninety who sat round a great room, the master walking up and down the middle. The College Hall, where we met afterwards, was a new venture, an attempt to plant something like an English University College in a Scotch University. St. Leonard's, now the central building of the girls' school, was the scene of it, and we had the run of the large garden, and could learn something of Astronomy and of other sciences from the inscriptions which bordered its walks, placed there, I think, by Sir David Brewster. It is not necessary to speak of the reasons which prevented this institution from taking root in the university system of Scotland, but those who called it into existence had reason to congratulate themselves on the collection of young men who were its inmates in its record year, when I first knew it. An interesting photograph of them is a cherished possession of my own. . . . In it are to be seen a number of men who afterwards came to be well known. Lang himself, by much the first of these, stands in the centre, with Henderson, afterwards Sheriff, who shared his room. The present Duke of Argyll (now the late Duke) and his brother Lord Archibald Campbell; Low and Jamieson, afterwards Lords of Session; Cox, afterwards M.P. for Edinburgh; Cook, now Sir Henry; the Warden, Mr. H. T. Rhoades, and the Tutor, John Birrell, who became Professor of Hebrew in St. Mary's College. They were

THE COLLEGE HALL GROUP, 1862-63

A. Low. A. E. Henderson. A. Lang. W. S. Cooper. J. Paterson.
W. Gordon. A. Jameson. Mr. Rhoades. G. T. Chiene. Mr. Birrell. E. S. Mitchell Innes. Lord Lorne.
H. Cook. A. Menzies. R. Cox. Lord A. Campbell. J. L. Ewing.

an interesting family, and if they did not figure largely in the prize lists, yet they were justified in their careers."

A few words may be added from an account of the College Hall written by Andrew Lang himself. "There was a rule," he says, "that we were only to go out on the evenings of Friday and Saturday, and Principal Shairp asked Rhoades if he thought men could break bounds? The Warden, who is extremely agile, stepped from a first floor window, and in a moment was on the top of the garden wall. But that was not the method of secret exit usually adopted. I do not remember it, but a contemporary has told me that one night we all went out and innocently roamed about the country. However, in our first year, certain wild youths were caught out twice in a week, and there was trouble and our ranks were thinned.

"We had a manuscript Magazine, copiously illustrated; I was the Editor—and the author to a considerable extent—but the Duke and Lord Archibald were the leading artists. We made one pound sterling by publishing a single number, and bought therewith two bats without cane handles, as cricket prizes. The Duke got one for batting, and I got the other, I think, for bowling, or *vice versa*. We played the University at football in the second year, but as we had no field of selection, being only thirteen and having to borrow Louis Milne (later Bishop of Bombay) and Donald Mackenzie, we had no look in. . . .

"From our little company of the first two years came Judges of the land, Sheriffs too, and Professors and Members of Parliament. If we were indolent at seventeen, it appears we overcame the malady." [1]

In another place Andrew Lang writes, "If we did little good, we did still less harm, and perhaps we took in uncon-

[1] *Votiva Tabella*, p. 412.

sciously a good store of happiness from the ruined towers, the long rollers always breaking on the limitless sands, the ivy mantling the ruined walls of St. Leonard's Chapel, the rose light in the wintry sky, all the memories that haunt the ancient city and the windy shores. We made other memories too, which we leave there, which we leave unspoken; the world is full of these, every man has his own place that is haunted by the vision of lost faces, the sound of silent speech. On St. Andrews sands, too, 'the sea moans round with many voices.'"[1]

The College Hall—as these two accounts of it indicate—was always more remembered as a home of 'indolent and rejoicing youth,' than as a place of learning. When Allan Menzies was there from 1862-65, Ferrier was Professor of Moral Philosophy, and his Class was taken in 1863-64. Veitch was heard in Logic, W. Y. Sellar in Greek, Fischer in Mathematics and Swan in Natural Philosophy. But it was the charm of the place and the life among these congenial friends that he would speak about; his reminiscences were full of these rather than of his Professors and studies. Tulloch was by that time Principal of St. Mary's but the College Hall student naturally did not meet him then, though they afterwards became intimate friends as fellow-members of the New Speculative Society.

My Father was a successful student, though it must be said that he was ploughed once in Mathematics. He had a great distaste for that science, and on hearing that he had passed it for his degree, he went back to his room and consigned all his mathematical books gladly to the flames. He became a good golfer in those early days; his style was neat and clean, and he played a good average game. And he bathed all the year round in the St. Andrews sea.

[1] *Alma Mater's Mirror*, p. 24.

Once when he had swum far out a sportsman on the coast fired a shot at him, taking him for a seal or some other strange denizen of the deep.

In 1865, after taking his M.A. degree, Allan Menzies returned to Edinburgh, where he entered the Divinity Hall and took his B.D. He was probably attracted to Edinburgh for family reasons; his mother lived there. We read about his life at this time in an account he wrote for a Memoir of his friend and fellow-student (afterwards his brother-in-law), the Rev. James M'Farlan of Ruthwell. "Dr. Crawford, our Divinity Professor, was a man of keen logical intellect, which he exercised in defending the doctrines of the Confession of Faith. He had a fine devotional turn, and in private was genial and friendly, but there was no escape with him from that close atmosphere of doctrinal orthodoxy, in which Scotland had been shut up since the time of the Haldanes. . . .

"Dr. Lee was a very attractive teacher. He was essentially a critic, and led us into the questions about the Gospels and into other matters affecting the New Testament, with great acuteness and power.

"M'Farlan was a member of a very happy band of Divinity students who saw each other a great deal, and were probably of great use to each other. There was a Preaching Society consisting of nine members. Each member in his turn conducted a complete service in Greenside Church on two Monday afternoons during the session, the others criticising his performance afterwards in the vestry. The criticisms were very profitable to me at least. Jardine, Theodore Marshall, Mitford Mitchell (the last two became Moderators of the Church of Scotland), Jolly, M'Farlan, Ballingal, Niven, Walter Scott, Allan Menzies: these were the members during my last year. We also

met often in each other's rooms and had discussions. Very various views were represented in our little society ; there was the legal Church view, the popular Church view, and other views of a more ideal and distant nature ; humour was supplied by some members, shrewdness by others. On Saturdays we walked in the country, sometimes as far as Queensferry, and had refreshments at some small inn.

"Most of us were also members of the Diagnostic Society, which sat on Thursday evenings from 8 till 11, and many a lively walk home we had by moonlight, down the Bridges and along Princes Street, which we sometimes had all to ourselves. On some fine nights these walks were extended so as to take in Queen Street and even the Dean Bridge."

Dr. Ballingal, writing of the time when Allan Menzies occupied the humble student benches, says, "His comrades loved him then for the sunny brightness of his nature, for his ready humour, for his friendship, but all were aware of the moral strength and devoutness that lay deep within. Even then he was a stay to many a one whose character was less steady. And both in these days and to the last he had a strong disgust at anything that savoured of spite, malice or guileful self-interested dealing. That kind of feeling used to bring into his eyes a look—which many of you will remember—a look of pained surprise that such things could be possible.

"These were the days of a rigid and somewhat barren orthodoxy in Churches and Divinity Halls, all the more rigid perhaps because instinctively we were conscious that change was impending. What were known as broad views were coming in like a flood, and it needed a good deal of courage in students who espoused them to stand fast.

Allan Menzies was of course on that side, and courage was never wanting nor a fine scorn of consequences: for he never had the least sympathy with any looseness in thought or conduct, and kept a firm grasp of the essential things in religion."

In the Journal of this time we often find the entry, "Wrote a prayer." He had a great gift of simple, devout language, and this habit of writing prayers—because he could not help it—he kept up all his life. He wrote new prayers for almost all the religious services he conducted, and these in consequence were always fresh and in sympathy with the occasion. In after years, at St. Andrews, when daily service was instituted in the College Chapel, he wrote many prayers for these services; but some of the most beautiful were written for Family Worship in his own house, a good old Scottish custom which he observed, with few exceptions, every day of his life.

In 1865 my Father became tutor to two boys at Ascog, in Bute. Here he made the acquaintance of Patrick Stevenson, afterwards minister of Inverarity, who was at that time in charge of a small chapel in the grounds of the Marquis of Bute at Mount Stuart, near Rothesay.

"For a year and a half," writes Allan Menzies, in an account of his friend, "I was his close companion, and the friendship formed then continued till his death, continues still. . . . He had a strong desire for knowledge, and we read together much history and some science; he studied botany with his microscope and kept in close touch with the life of the seashore. Many a walk we had together to the house of some sick person or bent on some piece of exploration. We had a boat of our own, and were much on the sea as well as in it."

There are many amusing stories of this time. He

and Patrick Stevenson used to swim out every morning to see a certain steamer pass. One day Mr. Stevenson happened to be on board the steamer, and when it passed the usual meeting place he overheard one seaman say to another, "Aye, man, there he is. But whaur's the ither deevil the day?"

Being in that neighbourhood, it was convenient for Allan Menzies to take licence from Dunoon Presbytery. On the day appointed, he went to the church, where he found an old minister walking about. He took the young student into a pew, where they talked together in a friendly fashion for some time. In the course of the conversation the minister asked him, "And how many days did God take to make the world?" "I don't know," was the reply, which so shocked the worthy minister that he left the pew. On his return half an hour later, the student was astonished to find that the friendly talk had been the examination. The examiner had left him to confer with his colleagues as to whether a young man who did not know the length of time occupied by the Creation could be allowed to pass. He was not passed, but severely admonished and told to come back some months later, when if he did not give a more satisfactory answer licence could not be granted. When he did return, however, he met with another examiner; this difficult question was not raised, and he was accordingly licenced to preach the Gospel.

Before he was licenced, probably in 1867, he and Dr. Ballingal spent a *Sommer-Semester* at the University of Erlangen. There is no record of that time, but Dr. Ballingal recalls that Dr. Franz Delitsch, a very orthodox old gentleman, had evening *Symposiums* for his students, when they discussed current questions with the help of beer and smoke.

II

THE MINISTRY

On his return to Scotland, Allan Menzies entered at once on the work of the ministry. "As was characteristic of him," writes Dr. Ballingal, "he did not begin with an easy place, but entered upon mission work in the Havannah, one of the worst slum districts of Glasgow, now reformed out of existence. Here he was unwearied, and greatly won the love of the degraded people, whom he tried to help in every possible way." He had a meeting every Saturday night, when people came to sign the pledge, and there were several who came every week to sign it. Their good resolutions did not carry them far into the next seven days; still he considered their insistence in coming was to their credit.

He lived at that time with his eldest sister, who was married to Campbell Douglas, F.R.I.B.A. One day when my Father met his sister at the station on her return from a brief absence, he said casually, "I hope you won't mind, but you will find a woman who is not long out of jail in your house washing clothes."

While he was doing this hard and sometimes discouraging work in Glasgow, the young minister kept a canoe on the Canal as an outlet and recreation, and he used to visit his friend James McFarlan at his home, the Manse of Muiravonside, in this manner. He would arrive in his fragile

craft with a silk nightshirt in his pocket, looking so much a part of his vessel that it almost seemed as if it had been built round him. We find from his Journals at this time, too, what keen pleasure he had in music. This was to some extent cut off from him in later days by his deafness, but as a young man he heard all the music he could, and used to say that it helped him with his work. All forms of beauty appealed strongly to him.

In the autumn of 1870 he went to Athelstaneford to take charge of that parish during the absence of the minister. He stayed there for nearly eighteen months, and it was when leaving and looking out for other work that he wrote these words to his Mother, who was anxious about his future: "There are still five months of my time here to run, and I have no doubt that before they expire I shall have been otherwise provided. I have been usefully engaged, have learnt much, and have, I believe, found favour both with God and man, fully up to what there was reason to expect. And seeing that I have always done simply what lay nearest, and known it to be the right thing to do, I am in no anxiety that the leading of the Father may have led or ever will lead me far wrong. I hope you will enjoy the strength and comfort of the same assurance.

"I heartily sympathize with your disregard of rewards for doing right. It is of the spirit of Him whose meat and drink it was to do His Father's will, and who did not look forward, but lived each present day for the duties it brought. This is my ideal of life, to be able to live on doing right, without anxiety and without calculation, and to feel that it is all a teaching and a drawing, which we neither originate nor control, but which leads to something far beyond our hopes, though we cannot see how. If we could but steadily believe that we are being taught and led

in everything. . . . I am vexed with a lady of eighty-four, who is not very ill, but thinks she is useless and has lived too long and that her children are tired of her. What to say?"

In June, 1872, he went to assist Dr. Wylie, minister of Carluke, whom he describes as "a splendid old minister, a true gentleman and a warm-hearted friend." His year at Carluke was a very happy one, full of delightful intercourse. It was there that he first met John and Edward Caird, who were often at the Manse (Edward Caird married the eldest Miss Wylie), and we find in his Diary such entries as "New Sermon interrupted by Edward Caird." He was evidently very happy and working at full pressure; several times we find the record, "writing all day," and once or twice "wrote all night." He was much at the Manse, and enjoyed the companionship of the Wylies and of their friends. The Manse of Carluke seems to have been a centre of activity, both intellectual and otherwise, and he found it a congenial and stimulating atmosphere.

In 1873 he was presented by the Crown—one of the last to be appointed by patronage—to the parish of Abernyte. "This small and beautiful parish," to quote again from Dr. Ballingal, "is situated on the braes of the Carse of Gowrie at the foot of the Sidlaw Hills. It suited him admirably, the work being light, and so allowing time for the pursuit of his deeper studies. These began to engross him more and more, though during his sixteen years at Abernyte, he was always at the service of his people, and became their friend and helper."

When my Father went to Abernyte there was an unwritten law that no one should go for a walk on Sunday. But he soon dispelled such mistaken ideas. The minister,

with his dog at his side, was often to be seen walking about the parish on the Lord's Day, either visiting the sick or simply out to enjoy and rejoice in all the wonderful works of the Creator. For he was a lover of Nature. He never ceased to wonder at the beauty spread around him, nor at the goodness of God in providing such a fair world for His creatures. It was this love of Nature that led him to find in Wordsworth his favourite poet, though his volume of Browning was never far away, and there was a long shelf of the poets in the Manse library, well-worn volumes all. He was a wide reader, and was as much at home in his Goethe and Schiller as in his Shakespeare.

During his early years at Abernyte he turned his intimate knowledge of the German language to good account. He translated Baur's *Paul*; the same author's *First Three Centuries of the Christian Church*; Pfleiderer's *Philosophy of Religion*, which had been begun by the late Principal Stewart; and co-operated with J. Sutherland Black in translating Wellhausen's *History of Religion*.

My Father was very happy amongst his people. Their simplicity and want of show or artificiality appealed to a nature that was itself absolutely simple and sincere. There is a good story of his visit to an old woman who was addicted to the pleasures of a cutty pipe. He went in, and perceiving the smell of tobacco, said to her in his friendly way, "Well, Janet, been having a draw?" She made no reply, and for the whole of his visit she remained dumb. Shortly after he had gone, another minister called. He adopted a more serious tone, and enquired in a voice of deep solemnity, "Well, Janet, how is it with your soul to-day?" But this question pleased her no better than the last. She made no reply, but when her visitor had gone, she turned indignantly to

her niece, who kept house for her, and said, "Twa impident rascals thae!"

Allan Menzies had all his life the greatest admiration and affection for his Mother. She visited him at Abernyte, and greatly enjoyed meeting his friends. He felt that he owed to her not only his thorough grounding in the excellent German and Scottish schools, but the buoyancy of spirit, the self-reliance and the cheerful outlook which, being so strong in herself, she had imparted naturally by example and teaching to her children. Whenever the family met in after years, there were always many stories told of the brave Mother of whom they were so proud. She was the sacred core of a family united by the strongest ties of affection, and owing much to one another.

In the latter years of his Mother's life Allan had become a great strength and support to her, and she consulted him about all her affairs, as we see from the many letters from her that were found among his papers. She died in 1875, and beside the bundle of her letters to him these lines were found in his handwriting, written, it is supposed, just after her death.

No break in the dark cloud over,
  No light on the graves beneath:
And the wrecking pitiless storm-wind
  Swept wildly over the heath,
As borne by the hands that loved her
  And followed by feet whose tread
Was ever met with her welcome,
  She was laid with her sacred dead.

. . . . . .

Still is the night: the whispering stream
  Through silver silence heard afar:

Pure clear and still the open heavens,
Where star is gathering light from star:
Stilled is the noisy city's voice,
Soft rests the infant's weary head:
And still the moonbeam on the cross
That watches o'er the sacred dead.

O world unknown, far off yet nigh,
In vain our questioning voices rise
To beat against the silent heavens
That hide our loved ones from our eyes.
And yet methinks from silent heavens
There falls to-night a faint reply:
"If God be God, she rests in peace,
If God be God, she cannot die."

"Above the cloud, above the storm,
Centred in God's eternal peace,
She sees the error and the pain
From where the pain and error cease."
She sees the sad: her fears are gone,
Quenched with the sorrows of the night:
She loves as when she loved on earth,
She loves: but now she loves in light.

. . . . . .

O tender heart, that never drew
A pleasure from another's grief,
O gentle voice, that ever knew
The timely word to bring relief,
No more with tears of joy I gaze
Upon thy life's unsullied page,
Where joined the pure heart of the child
With tender grace of saintly age.

Farewell, blest spirit, Saint of God!
Thy image with thy children dwell,
Through all the sad dark dream of life
To teach our hearts that all is well.
Farewell, my mother, sweet and pure,
Until the eternal morning rise,
And through the gathering mist of death
I feel thy soft hand on my eyes.

Abernyte Manse stood in an ideal situation looking over the wooded slopes of the Carse away to the river Tay in the distance. It was a picturesque old house, covered with roses. But when my Father first went to live in it, it was very damp, and only after much agitation and after the case had been taken to the Sheriff Court, did the heritors make the necessary repairs. In the meantime the minister had contracted ague, an illness from which he suffered intermittently all the rest of his life.

Attached to the Manse, as was usual in those days, there was a miniature farmyard The minister kept a pony, a cow, and the usual domestic animals. One cow was specially recommended to him by its former owner because it would eat 'ony kind o' combustible.' And one of the tragedies of country life is entered in the Journal in the words, "Death of my dear pig."

There was a succession of dogs in the Manse to keep the minister company—Athelstane, who had come from his first charge; Hobab, a large and faithful retriever; Victor, who among many delightful habits possessed the unfortunate one of hunting in the neighbouring policies and caused the minister a good deal of anxiety.

My Father was always fond of animals and considerate of their feelings. He thought it an intolerable hardship

that his pony, with which he brought up his visitors and their luggage from Inchture station, four miles away—should be compelled to look always straight in front and never to the side. So he dispensed with the customary blinkers. But one morning his co-Presbyter, Dr. Honey of Inchture (afterwards his father-in-law), was driving early to his fishing. When passing through the parish of Abernyte, he came upon two figures lying by the roadside. They proved to be the minister of Abernyte and his brother Alick, who were driving to the early train. The pony had been freed from his blinkers for the first time, and was found peacefully munching grass a little further on, while the trap lay in the ditch with both shafts broken.

In those years, although my Father was working closely at his translations, he had many visitors at the Manse. One of his great friends was Lucy Smith, the widow of William Smith, author of *Thorndale* and *Gravenhurst*, "a man of genius and rare fineness of nature, the friend of Mill, Sterling, Maurice and Lewes." My Father came to know Lucy Smith just after her husband's death, and had great respect for her mental powers as well as admiration for her courage. She gives us a little picture of him in his pulpit at Abernyte. "I think of you this bright April morning, and am glad that I can see you in your church, with its attentive congregation—you in the pulpit, and even the long-handled boxes for the collection, all so clearly in my mind's eye. I follow the career of such men as Mr. Knight, Mr. Stevenson and yourself with deep and genuine interest. There is no resisting the law of evolution in thought any more than elsewhere. The great fundamental conceptions must be differently expressed. Happy are they who are quite sure of one or two truths."

It was probably because they both saw beauty and goodness in everything, both lived and felt and thought so keenly, both possessed the gifts of "sympathy, cheer and a tender radiance" that this friendship meant so much to them both.

Professor Knight, who was then minister at Dundee, often came to Abernyte, and he and my Father compiled a set of *Services for Sunday Schools*, which went through many editions and is still largely used in the Church of Scotland; also *Home Prayers*, a manual for Family Worship, which appeared in 1879.

In 1880 Professor Knight edited a volume of *Scotch Sermons*, which "was intended to give some evidence of the progress of liberal thought on the part of ministers of the Church of Scotland, and was allowed to have done so." Allan Menzies contributed two sermons to this volume, and among the other writers were Principal John Caird, Principal Cunningham, Principal Story, Professor Knight, Patrick Stevenson and William Mackintosh. The book attracted a good deal of attention—it was much ahead of its time, and even gave rise to suggestions of a heresy hunt, which, however, came to nothing.

Patrick Stevenson was another frequent visitor at the Manse. He belonged, like Professor Knight and Allan Menzies, to the New Speculative Society, of which Principal Tulloch was president, and which counted among its members Lewis Campbell, Professor Bayne, Dean Aglen, Henry Gourlay, Sheriff Cheyne, Sheriff Bell and others. The Society met at the houses of its members for the discussion of philosophical, religious and social questions. My Father was away once a month at the meetings, often at St. Andrews, where he had many friends, and where he was for several years Examiner in Classics for the M.A.

degree. He read two papers on the *Ethische Richtung* in Holland, which provided material for discussion at another meeting, when Principal Tulloch led the debate.

My Father belonged also to a Clerical Club of ministers of the Carse of Gowrie, who met once a month at the various manses to read papers and discuss theology. Partly on account of the mispronunciation of the long word by the Abernyte Manse children, partly because of the happy nature of these meetings, this Society afterwards became known as the *Theojolical*. There was another club of half a dozen members which met for a week each summer in a Highland Glen or at an English Lake, and engaged in fishing, mountaineering and talking.

In these and other ways the ministers of the Carse of Gowrie helped one another, brightening one another's lives and increasing their usefulness to their flocks in times that were difficult. My Father wrote a description of their ways and circumstances in an introduction to a volume of Sermons by Carse Ministers.

"The writer of these lines came to the Carse of Gowrie thirty years after the Disruption. Dr. Caird had by that time accomplished his distinguished ministry at Errol, and Dr. Macduff had been at St. Madoes; but the feelings aroused by the Disruption had not died away; the division of society remained, and the multiplication of small churches, with all the difficulties and jealousies it necessarily brings in its train.

"The life of a minister in the Carse had accordingly no lack of trials, to whatever Church he belonged; and these were enhanced in the last quarter of the nineteenth century by two causes, of which a word may be said. It was a time of political unrest, the Disestablishment agitation was being vigorously pressed forward, and the ministers

of the Church of Scotland found themselves compelled to defend the Kirk in other ways than that of faithful attendance to their pastoral duty. They were attacked in the Press and on the local platform; attempts were made to arouse the class feeling of the ploughmen against them; Church defence became their duty, and this exposed them to new insinuations, so that it was not always easy for them to live in charity with all men. All this did not add to the happiness of parish ministers at that time; yet the trial may have been good for them. It certainly made them determined to uphold and strengthen their Church in every way open to them, and to do their duty to their flocks and to the public in such a manner that no charge of negligence should be made against them. In this, it may be said, they were successful.

"If the Disestablishment agitation kept the inhabitants of the manses awake and somewhat anxious, there was another cause which did so no less. The time was, as everyone knows, a very trying one for agriculture, the main industry in the Carse, on which the great body of the people depends. A long succession of bad seasons tried the faith and patience of the whole community; the fall of the prices of agricultural produce completed the ruin the bad seasons had begun. The minister had to address a congregation of those who were not getting on well in the world; their crops were failing; for what they had to take to market they brought home very little money; one after another, the farmers were finding themselves unable to carry on their business. The ministers suffered directly in the general affliction: stipends, not at all too large before, fell seriously in value; the horse and carriage had to be given up; the household was sorely straitened. But the worst trial was that it was so difficult to cheer or

encourage in any way those who looked to the Church and minister to comfort them. One could direct their attention to the spiritual unseen world; but an agricultural community needs hope in this world too, and that hope it was so hard to find!

"Such were the discouragements of the manse in the 'seventies and 'eighties; but it helped one greatly to bear the burden, that the brethren in the other manses were also feeling its weight, and were yet living their lives and discharging their duties and something more. Perhaps the period is somewhat mellowed to one's mind by a mist of years; but it does appear that the parish ministers of the Carse were, when the writers of these sermons were living together, very happy in each other's friendship, and that their relations with each other helped them greatly to endure what was undoubtedly for all of them a time of trial. . . .

"Clerical Clubs are known in various parts of Scotland; but none of them, I am sure, can have been happier or better for its members than that of the Carse of Gowrie. It met on Monday, about ten times a year, at the manses in rotation, and the time was spent in discussing a passage of Scripture, appointed beforehand to be taken up, and in considering some point of ministerial or parochial duty, or some question then before the country, in which the Club was interested. . . . My general impression of these meetings is that they were very friendly and peaceable. There were no extreme differences of view, and such differences as did appear were treated frankly and at the same time tolerantly, so that interest was well sustained, and the members all carried home with them something they had not brought there. . . . After these discussions came lunch with the ladies of the manse where

the Club met; and then the journey home, brightened often with the fresh thoughts one had received. And so it came that the ministers of the Carse were very united and friendly with each other, and that they helped to keep each other up to the mark in many ways. . . . Altogether the Church life of the period I speak of is a thing which, if one may venture to say so, may be remembered with satisfaction. . . . One might speak of the generous hospitality of the manses of those days: or of the friendship which subsisted between the ministers and the nobles and gentlemen of the Carse: or of the many good works, mostly very quiet and unobtrusive, yet not on that account less useful, which centered in the manses. One might speak of the prowess of the ministers in spheres outside the pulpit, how one of them was a famous salmon fisher, another a mechanician, optician, astronomer, photographer and artist: how one studied Hebrew and another the theology of Germany and Holland. . . . The contents of this volume carry me back in mind to many an early sunset in the Carse, and to many a glorious summer afternoon amid the waving corn, through which we travelled home. . . . They also make me scent again the old teaching, now so rare, with its solemnity and earnestness, and its searching sweetness."

Allan Menzies had a great delight in travel, both at home and abroad. He was in Paris for the first time in 1876 with his brother Robert. His visit began and ended with the Louvre, but it included also visits to many churches, to Versailles, and to a Parisian Circus, where he saw deeds of daring that were never forgotten. And there are many entries in his Journals of visits to his sister and brother-in-law, John Macwhirter, in London. The painter would sometimes take the minister to the Royal

Academy, the National Gallery, or, best of all, to the studio of some famous fellow-artist.

His taste for foreign travel was no doubt due in part to his early upbringing and his tours on the Continent at that time. He was never more happy than when setting out on a journey, and the first thing to do on returning from one holiday was to plan the next. Planning was in itself a great satisfaction. Railway time-tables had a strange fascination for him; and he seemed to have an uncanny sense of where a passing train was going, where it had come from, how many minutes late it was, and this in foreign countries as well as in his own. Dr. Ballingal, who sometimes accompanied him on his walking excursions in Germany and the Scottish Highlands in the 'seventies and 'eighties, writes, "Never had his companion need to take thought about train hours or about ways of sending on knapsacks by the German post-waggons so as to ensure their recovery at a given point. He easily saw to all these details; he even found a joy in mastering the whole railway system of some vast German plain so that from a height he could point to distant puffs of smoke and identify these as the 'fast to Munich' or the 'slow to Nürnberg.' When in the Black Forest we often put up at very unpromising small inns, where beds and food left a good deal to be desired, but he always accepted whatever it was as if he were daily accustomed to nothing different, and indeed specially good food and good wine, when we came across them, seemed less to his taste. It was the same with the hardships of the road: rain or storm or extreme heat were taken always philosophically. He had great delight in a mountain ascent, the Hornisgrunde, for example, where we struggled up through thickets of knee-deep crowberries and blaeberries, varied

by rocks and boulders, and encountered a violent thunder-storm, with torrents of rain. Always he had a kindly greeting for any tourists encountered by the way, and his interest in the life and habits of the people was very keen.

"Another time in the Black Forest, our route, rather an unusual one, led us up onto the great plateau, over 3000 feet above sea-level, which is known as the watchmaking district. It is bleak and bare, strewn with rocks, also with huge ugly factories, at each of which some one part of a watch's machinery is turned out. The peasants' cottages, battered and weather worn, are devoted to the same industry. Menzies showed extraordinary interest in these forms of industry, and liked to talk to the people about their work.

"Another day we found ourselves on the tableland whence, on different sides, streams flow down to join the Rhine and the Danube. This place, desolate to the last degree, veined by sluggish streams of black water gathered here and there into deep round pools, fascinated him. The idea of the long travel on which the streams were setting out—to the Black Sea and the North Sea—and all the country to be passed through, gave to this wonderful birth-place of two great rivers a strange charm, in spite of its rather common-place aspect. It seemed like a visit to the beginning of the world.

"In other parts of the Black Forest, where the leaping streams were caught and utilised by the villagers to supply them with electric light, or were harnessed to various domestic tasks by cleverly contrived machinery, these arrangements gave Menzies the greatest delight. Then the way-side shrines, tawdry enough at times, seemed always to awaken the deep inner devoutness of his nature.

The peasant's undeveloped superstitious religion was to him truly in unison with higher and more intelligent conceptions, and he felt a real reverence even for the rude symbols, whose fresh paint often so appallingly discorded with the beauties of nature.

"He had a great delight in natural beauty of sky and plain, mountain and sea, though not quite an artist's delight. Life, I think, in any form always had a stronger appeal, and the inner life of men's thoughts most of all. Hence came that quick sympathy for the comfort and well-being of others which made him so companionable."

His life became fuller in 1878, when, on Lady Day, he became engaged to Mary Elizabeth Honey, the eldest daughter of his co-Presbyter and nearest neighbour, Dr. Honey of Inchture. They were married on July 31 of the same year, and there is a Journal of the wedding-tour, when for six weeks books were laid aside and the minister and his bride explored the Western Highlands. One extract from the Journal will suffice to show the ideal world in which these days were spent. "Our first day at Glen Shiel," he writes, "was one of those which we feel, when we are living them, ought not to end: no other day will be the same—but new ones will begin and swell out, each to its own shade of happiness. God is good."

My Father and Mother were distantly related through the same family to which Dr. Chalmers belonged. My Mother was truly a daughter of the Manse, for her father was the sixth minister in direct line of succession from an Episcopal curate, Merchiston of Kilpatrick-Juxta, who lived in the seventeenth century. And the line is still being carried on by her brother, the Rev. John Honey, the present minister of Inchture. Her great-grandfather was Dr. Adamson, minister of the first charge of St.

Andrews and at the same time Professor of Theology at the University ; and her grandfather was John Honey, son-in-law of Dr. Adamson, long remembered at St. Andrews for a deed of extraordinary courage.

"On the 3rd of January, 1800, a terrible storm raged all along the East Coast, and the *Janet* of Macduff, a coasting vessel, was driven upon the East Sands of St. Andrews Bay. There was an induction in the College Church that day, and young Honey was there, seated at the end of a pew in his red gown. As Dr. Adamson passed up the church to the pulpit, he stopped to whisper to his student, who was known to be a powerful swimmer, 'Honey, there is a ship in distress in the Bay. You may be of more service there than here.' The streets lay deep in snow, and the wind was so bitterly cold that few cared to face it. Yet when, in the forenoon, signal guns and bell announced a wreck in the Bay, old and young hurried to the shore to watch for the end. No boat could live in such a sea, and so the crowd waited, painfully conscious of its helplessness. It was at this moment that they were joined by John Honey.

"He was tall and strong, easily leader in all athletic sports. He was fair and of a sunny disposition, beloved by all who knew him. When he reached the shore he stripped and entered the water, but the crowd restrained him, for it seemed hopeless and foolhardy to brave such a heavy sea. Some time was lost in debate, but at length Honey prevailed, permitting his friends to tie a rope round him to pull him through the surf if he failed. He was armed with a knife, which he carried between his teeth, and his first act, after throwing himself into the waves, was to free himself from the rope.

"For a week the vessel had been drifting helplessly before the storm, and for the last three days the crew had tied themselves to the rigging, where exposure, cold and want of food had reduced them to despair. The waves were mountains high, the weather so boisterous that when the ship struck the crew could do nothing but wait for what help might come to them from the shore.

"When Honey reached the wreck, the men were stiff with cold and scarcely able to move. Honey helped one to untie himself, and together they entered the sea. He was brought to the shore, and willing hands received him there, while Honey returned for another. He did this a third time, each time bringing back a seaman, stiff, frozen and helpless. On the fourth venture he found there were only left the captain and the mate, brothers, who were tied in the shrouds and who refused to be separated, the captain telling Honey to save himself. While the argument proceeded, the mainsail fell, and the bar struck Honey on the side. 'Here,' said he, 'I have put my life in peril for you, and you will not do your part and come.' On this the mate cast himself loose and threw himself overboard into Honey's arms. Honey took him ashore, and then went back for the captain and saved him also.

"Later, in grateful recognition of his heroism, he was presented with the Medal of the Royal Humane Society and a silver cup bearing the inscription that it was given as a token of esteem for his 'intrepidity, courage and compassion, when at the imminent hazard of his own life, by successive efforts, he rescued five shipwrecked mariners from a watery grave.' He received also the freedom of the City of St. Andrews, and what he probably valued more, he received in marriage the hand and heart of Dr. Adamson's daughter."

But the blow from the bar of the mainsail, added to his superhuman exertions, had injured him. His hair turned white before the next morning, and he was only thirty years old when he died. He was minister of Bendochy, near Perth.

His eldest son, John Adamson Honey, was also a student at St. Andrews. Dr. Chalmers at that time occupied the Chair of Moral Philosophy, and Honey was admitted to a special class that Dr. Chalmers taught on Sunday evenings. On completing his arts course, John Honey went to Edinburgh for Divinity, and had for fellow-students there M'Cheyne, Norman MacLeod, the Bonars, M'Cosh, Hanna and many other men who afterwards became well known. Less than two years after receiving licence, John Honey was unanimously elected to the parish of Inchture, where he was minister for more than fifty years, and where his son succeeds him. Dr. Honey was a keen sportsman, and often left his manse at two in the morning to drive to his salmon fishing on the Tay. He was a tall, handsome, courtly 'gentleman of the olden time' and the spirit of hospitality was strong within him. In his youth he spent a year travelling in the East, and would talk of memorable days in the Holy Land before railways and their attendant evils had broken in on its beauty.

Mary Honey, the eldest daughter of Inchture Manse, was a helpmeet to her husband in the truest sense of the word. Lovers at the beginning, they were lovers to the end. She brought completion and happiness to his life, and was a real companion to him in his thought. She made his life free and happy, so that his mind was tuned to do its best work, and she had great pride in him and his eager search after truth. There were two daughters

born to that happy Manse at Abernyte; the elder was married in 1907 to Patrick F. M'Farlan, F.R.C.S., Stirling; the younger is the writer of these lines.

In 1881 Allan Menzies and his wife sailed from Leith for a short holiday in Northern Holland. There is an interesting account of this tour in the Journal, and of his meeting with several Dutch theologians at Leiden.

"Rauwenhoff talked German easily, but with curious low-country corruptions, and he spoke of the *Ethische Richtung*, about which he had written in the *Tijdschrift*. All the students who want to get on in the Church go, he says, to the more orthodox University of Utrecht; the effect of a late measure giving congregations the choice of their ministers has been to close the door to licentiates of liberal views in the towns and country districts of the South. In the North, where the peasants are, in general, proprietors, a freer spirit reigns, and men of the modern school can be chosen. Up to this time the higher Church authorities are on the liberal side, and recommend modern men for University chairs; but this is a result of the old system, and will gradually be worked out, with the result of leaving the Moderns in the position of a powerless minority, when it will probably become necessary for them to leave the Reformed Church. The divergence of view on the meaning of the Subscription Formula, which according to Scotch notions is a lax one, is very wide: and it seems impossible that the two tendencies so sharply opposed to each other as the Modern and what is called here the Orthodox can permanently remain together.

"Kuenen is one of the most charming men I ever saw. Tall, stooping slightly, with a most benevolent cast of features, he receives his guest with the greatest geniality,

and talks in a pleasant, kindly way, with evident interest. He spoke of the lectures of Professor Robertson Smith, just published, with great admiration, saying that few men could have written such a book in three months, and enquiring as to the probable issue of the case before the Assembly. He also produced *Scotch Sermons* from a shelf; he had been reading Caird's, and wanted to know what sermon was exciting opposition in Scotland. He spoke of the progress of liberal theology in Holland, 'we have perhaps gone too fast'; but was satisfied with the results gained in the attempts of the liberals to popularize their notions. All Kuenen's colleagues speak of him with pride and affection, and few men probably combine such courage and thoroughness with such sweetness and breadth of temper. A notable man of whose acquaintance we may reasonably be proud.

"Land, whose tract on Spinoza I have translated, is a young man of great force and strength who apparently knows everything. He took us in the afternoon to the University Library and the Botanic Gardens attached to the College. In the Library they have a MS. Psalter which was made for Louis X. of France, and is beautifully illuminated; a Greek MS. of the sixth century, from Genesis to Deuteronomy, and various other treasures: and the arrangement of the book-shelves, as well as the Catalogue (which consists of small tied volumes, each leaf bearing the title of one book only, so that the name of a new book can be easily introduced by untying the string which holds them together), is worthy of notice and of imitation. In the evening we took tea with Professor Land: both he and his wife speak English well. They told us many things about the pronunciation of the language, the University, Spinoza, etc.

"Saturday, 14th May, 1881. Called on Professor Tiele this morning. He looks about thirty-five, but has lately celebrated his silver wedding, and is about fifty. He spoke of course about Ballingal and his translation. Also a good deal about the Boers in the Transvaal. He thought that the Dutch as a whole have confidence in England, and regard the settlement lately come to as a just one, though for the time the bond of brotherhood has naturally caused a strong anti-English feeling. Should the Boers not respect the government, but stir up new disturbances, he was sure Dutch sentiment would be against them."

In 1885 my parents spent another fortnight abroad. They sailed from Leith to Rotterdam, and continued the voyage up the Rhine in one of the little Dutch steamers. Their experience proved so delightful that it was often repeated in after years.

In 1888 Allan Menzies published a small volume called *National Religion*, consisting of twelve sermons on the Decalogue in its bearing on modern life. In his Preface he writes, "It appears to me that the Church is specially called in present circumstances to the defence on religious grounds of the foundations of society, and that even a fragmentary attempt to show that the various arrangements of the social state have their basis in reason and necessity or, in other words, the Will of God, may not be without its use. It will be found by those who consider the matter without prejudice that the Decalogue gains instead of losing in impressiveness, when the verdict of criticism is frankly accepted, which assigns it in its present form to the age of the Prophets. In the writings of these great men we can read the record of the sorrowful experience which called for the promulgation of such a code."

The book was favourably reviewed. All that we learn about it from my Father's private records is the remark in a letter to a friend, "The outside at least is pleasing." John MacWhirter had made a design of the sun rising over the hills and the sea, which gave the book an air of peace and serenity not belied by its contents.

Allan Menzies was known already to belong to the Broad Church party, but he further identified himself with it in 1888 by organising and signing, with 145 others, a Broad Church Manifesto, addressed to the Editorial Committee of *Euchologion*—a service book of the Church of Scotland. The Manifesto made an appeal in favour of "modifying the services by omitting the superfluity of doctrinal statements and recognizing the noble function of Christian worship to infuse a Christian spirit into all the occupations and relations of our complicated society, and not only to save the members of the Church out of the world, but to save the world by making it increasingly Christian. This appeal was answered by the inclusion in the volume of a Sunday (morning and evening) service, composed by the appellants and drafted by Dr. Menzies himself, which is one of the best in the collection." [1]

It was about this time (1888) that my Father gave a series

[1] I quote from a letter to the *Scotsman*, written after my father's death by the Rev. Mr. Kerr, late minister of Dirleton, who asks the Editor's permission to supplement the obituary notice in that paper by drawing attention to a "line of study and signal service rendered to his church and country by the learned Professor, namely, his wide knowledge of liturgical literature and his contributions to the improvement of devotional services in school and college, and the public worship of the Church, especially through the Church Service Society, of which he was a vice-president at the time of his death" (*Scotsman*, May 11, 1916).

of Sociological Lectures at St. Andrews in connection with the University Extension Scheme. The title was *Ideal Societies, Old and New*, and the Lectures dealt with Plato's *Republic*; Religious Communities; English Ideal Commonwealths; Socialism; Nihilism, etc. (There is now, however, no trace of these Lectures amongst his writings.)

In 1889 the University of Glasgow conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity, a distinction all the more appreciated that he was not an alumnus of that University and had no connection with it. His parishioners made this the occasion of showing their affection for him. They presented him with a revolving bookcase and study chair, gifts which ever after had the place of honour in his study. The presentation was made in the Manse garden one lovely summer afternoon; all the parish and many friends from elsewhere came and drank tea on the lawn. The speeches on that occasion have long since been forgotten, but it is remembered what warmth of feeling and affection prevailed, and how happy everyone was to do honour to the minister.

The Abernyte Manse Magazine of May, 1889, a monthly periodical edited by his daughters (ten and seven years old), has a little paper signed A. Menzies, and beginning thus, "The geese address each other as 'Missster' or 'Sussster,' according to sex. The ducks as 'doctor' or 'daughter.' Now, the goose is known to be a foolish animal, but ducks are dear to all, and their name is used as a term of endearment. To be called Doctor or Daughter therefore, as the ducks do, is thought a great honour, and when a Minister sits in his study writing instead of annoying other people, they sometimes change his name and say, 'You shall no longer be called "Missster," like the geese,

but "Doctor," like the ducks.' This is what happened to the head of this house on April 26."

That same year saw him appointed to the Chair of Biblical Criticism at St. Andrews. Not without opposition. There were objections to his admittedly Broad Church views, and also to his deafness. "Sometimes he was stigmatised as a heretic," writes Dr. Ballingal, "though that was usually done by people who did not understand his point of view. As a matter of fact, he was no heretic, but emphatically one of the faithful so far as regards the essentials of religion. With the life and teachings of Christ he was in full accord, and he lived that life and followed those teachings to an extent attained by few." He had his champions too: men who knew him, as his adversaries most certainly did not. It must be said that the most active of his opponents came to repent of his ill-judged action, and he and my Father had a good deal of correspondence in after years about their work. For my Father could never bear ill-will: he always gave others the credit of doing what they did from the best motives: he was never heard to say an unkind word; his charity was boundless.

Before leaving Abernyte, which he did with real regret, for there was a bond of the closest affection between him and his people, there was another gathering of the parishioners on the lawn, and afterwards a short meeting in the church, where the minister and the people he had ministered to for seventeen years took a kindly farewell of each other. At this time my Father—with great distaste for the task of "begging"—collected a sum of money in order that Abernyte Parish might be taken off the Smaller Livings, in other words, to ensure that the minister should have an income of £200 a year. This had never been the case in all

his seventeen years there, and he determined that the parish should no longer be one of the poorest in Scotland—financially and only financially, for otherwise it was one of the most desirable. It had a beautiful little church, and its manse and garden had been to him the abode of peace and happiness.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE FROM THE SOUTH-EAST

III

THE ST. ANDREWS YEARS

The Rev. Andrew Brown, minister of Morningside, Edinburgh, one of my Father's students, has given us, with some other reminiscences, an account of the Inaugural Lecture at St. Andrews.

"I was a second year's Arts student at the time," he writes, "and I well remember the talk in student circles. Dr. Menzies' advanced religious views were well known, and in certain influential quarters in the Church there had been unfavourable criticism of the appointment—even biting judgment. How would he act?

"The Class-room was crowded with Professors, students and others interested. Never was he more dignified, and never did he acquit himself better. He remembered, as he always did, the 'charity that thinketh no evil.' The Lecture was a brilliant success. From that day forward Dr. Menzies' position was assured. He won his way to the hearts of the students that day, and kept it right to the end. Personally I can never forget the inspiration I got from him. To go into his Class-room from the other Class-rooms was like going into pleasant summer weather from arctic cold. He warmed and fed, and he was so intensely interesting. There was an atmosphere of strength about him and gentleness. He was an elder brother to us as well as a Professor. When we met in

each other's rooms of an evening it was not so much University affairs which were discussed nor the ordinary themes which appealed to students. It was 'Allan's' lectures and the loveable personality of the man. Dr. Menzies' was a most reverent mind. Whatever was slovenly in prayer jarred upon him. In this, as in other matters connected with the preparation for the ministry, his example and influence were of the greatest possible service.

"He was a frequent visitor to Ceres, my first charge. The Manse was surrounded with beautiful trees, and when, at the end of three years, I was called from the quiet Fifeshire village to Aberdeen, he paid me a farewell visit, and said, 'You will be sorry to leave your trees.' Not a word about the people! He gave out his heart to nature himself, and in return received back the heart of nature, which is in some sense the heart of God.

"At my induction to the charge of the West Church of St. Nicholas, Aberdeen, he stood by me, and at the public luncheon following the religious ceremony he said some kindly things about me. I thanked him afterwards, and he replied, 'I am glad you are pleased. When I got to my feet everything I intended to say left me.' I had noticed this characteristic before. Sometimes in lecturing he would free himself from his notes and talk—and such talk, always to the point, clear and illuminating. At these times we laid down our pencils and listened delightedly.

"Another reminiscence. The year that saw his twenty-five years' tenure of the Chair of Biblical Criticism saw me elected to the charge of Morningside. His students, past and present, signalled the occasion by the presentation of an illuminated address. The Professor was much touched by this mark of affection and esteem on the part of his

pupils, and while his attention was occupied with them, I asked him if he would introduce me to my people at Morningside. He playfully wrote, 'Don't swell my head more; it is swelled enough already.' But he came—a humbler, honester, kindlier man than Allan Menzies, the 'beloved Professor,' St. Andrews has not known.

"Wisdom is the breath of the power of God, a pure influence flowing from the shores of the Almighty. When it is present, men take example of it, and when it is gone they desire it. 'And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever.'"

Allan Menzies was appointed to St. Andrews too late in the year to resign his parish before the beginning of the session, and so for the first winter he took lodgings in St. Andrews and returned every Friday afternoon to Abernyte for the week end. It was heavy work; all the parish work was crowded into Saturday, and there were five lectures a week to be written for his Class, not to speak of the preparation of sermons. He never liked preaching an old sermon, though he often re-wrote them. He used to write several sermons on one text; and he delighted to mystify one of his congregation, who marked the texts preached upon in his Bible with a carpenter's pencil, and so got into difficulties when the same text figured too often. Much midnight oil was consumed that winter, but the new Professor was well prepared for his duties by his years of quiet study and reading. The intercourse with his colleagues and his students gave him new zest for work; he had found a sphere eminently congenial to him, and threw himself into his duties with the tireless industry that was habitual to him, only now there was the added

happiness and ardour of a man giving the service for which he was most fitted.

Of his colleagues at St. Mary's College, Principal Cunningham, who had succeeded Principal Tulloch, was described by my Father as "keen in debate, outspoken in exposition of his opinions, but in character most kind and gentle." It is remembered that he realised how little his new colleague could hear of the debates at the Senatus, and how he would come in afterwards and give an account of these meetings in most graphic and racy language. Professor Alexander Mitchell, of the Church History Chair, though conservative in his views, yet felt as he grew older, that "progress in theology was not uncalled for." He was a kindly old gentleman, and we children rarely met him in the street without his bringing out of his pocket an apple or a pear from his own garden. John Birrell, of the Chair of Hebrew, was an old friend, for he had been the tutor at the College Hall when my Father was there as a student.

Of the Arts Professors, Lewis Campbell, the learned and enthusiastic Professor of Greek, was known to him already as a member of the New Speculative Society; Professor Seth was there only for one session, when he was succeeded for a brief period by Professor Henry Jones, one of my Father's best friends. With his other colleagues, Professors Knight, Meiklejohn, Scott Lang, Butler, McIntosh and Roberts, my Father was always on the best of terms. Professor Pettigrew, of the Chair of Medicine, was at that time deeply interested in aviation, and carried on his experiments in a piece of ground which he rented from my Father at the foot of our garden.

But my Father's chief friend at St. Andrews for the twenty-seven years of his life there was Professor Thomas

Purdie, of the Chair of Chemistry. Their friendship was inspired by the warmest affection, and they inspired affection in others. Their characters were not unlike—both were marked by the same absolute sincerity and simple piety. They stored up anecdotes to tell each other, and Professor Purdie, knowing how much my Father lost by his deafness, would often come in to tell him what was going on and give him any news which he thought would interest him. For all these years there was no more frequent or more welcome visitor to my Father's study. Death did not long separate them. Professor Purdie survived him by only seven months, and as a St. Andrews student said of them, "The passing of such men calls forth not so much sorrow for their death as thankfulness for their lives."

My Father was President for many years of the Professors' Golf Club, an august body that arranged every session contests with the other Scottish Universities, matches which were played sometimes at St. Andrews and sometimes at Montrose, Aberdeen, Muirfield, etc. In this connection Professor Lawson, of the English Literature Chair at St. Andrews, writes, "We often met on the links, and the refinements of his golfing experiences he took with him to the game of life, where his humour and kindliness softened difficulties for less experienced players."

About this time, in order to take rides with his daughters, my Father learnt to bicycle, and many short excursions were made in this way. The longest was a ride down the Moselle, when the new vintage had just been harvested, and the Scottish travellers were often consulted about its virtues by their hosts at the various points of call.

My Father's favourite walk at St. Andrews was down to the harbour and out to the end of the pier. The sea always drew him; he never tired of watching the waves rolling in, curving over and breaking; the grace of a breaking wave was to him a miracle of nature, and as a swimmer one of his favourite amusements was to take a "header" through a breaking wave. To the end he found unfailing comfort and delight in the sea. He often used to say he would like to be buried at sea; that was not possible, but he was buried on its brink, overlooking the wide expanse of its waters.

He continued to preach frequently after he became Professor at St. Andrews: twice at least in every session at the College Chapel, and he was always ready to take a Sunday in other churches, to act as supply, as he used to say, "when no one better could be found." He was on very friendly terms with Dr. Boyd, and when he came to St. Andrews A.K.H.B. welcomed him warmly, and claimed him at once as a member of the Kirk-Session *ex officio*. As an elder he had a district of the parish for which he was responsible, and he greatly enjoyed visiting his people. It reminded him of his happy days as parish minister, and he always came back refreshed from hearing the joys and sorrows of these friends. One thing which gave him unlimited pleasure was to find some hard-worked mother with a large family badly needing a holiday, and with no chance of getting it. He would provide the wherewithal, often without allowing the recipient to know where it came from, and would then rejoice to hear of the family having a week or a fortnight at the seaside or in the country, and to see on their return a glow of health where before had been pale cheeks. "I like a holiday myself," he would say.

The tenor of his days was very even. He was not a quick worker, and could not begin to write till his mind was packed with material. But he was a steady worker; a whole day off was a rare thing with him, and it was impossible to persuade him to take a holiday unaccompanied by a heavy box of books. Even on a railway journey his pockets would be bulging with some pamphlet or magazine relating to the work on hand. Except for a walk or a ride in the afternoon, his whole day was spent in work. Sometimes he read aloud to his family for an hour after dinner, and he led us through practically the whole of Sir Walter Scott in this way. At other times he took up Trollope, or Tennyson or Browning, and occasionally a good modern novel: but when he was tired and could hardly be troubled to read anything, he would often turn to the *Vital Spark*, which came to be one of the household classics; "Dougie's" sayings were family bye-words.

It was in June, 1888, that the family spent their first summer at Iona, where for many years afterwards they were to be found in the same little cottage on the shore of that strangely fascinating island. My Father was very happy there: he would go with a great box of books, and know that for a month he would not be disturbed in his work. The quiet beauty of the place, the feeling of its being set apart from the world—in the world but not of it—its indescribable atmosphere of peace and holiness, set as it was like a jewel in the waters of the Atlantic, all these things combined to make it an ideal place for the writing holiday of a scholar. There was ample opportunity, too, for boating and bathing, and he took his daughters for many voyages of exploration among the rocky islets of the Ross of Mull and sometimes over to the lighthouse of

Erraid. These voyages were made in a small open boat with a dipping lug. They were always full of adventure, and there were moments of excitement when the "skipper" would call out directions in nautical terms which the youthful crew did not understand.

The Cathedral of Iona had not yet been "restored," and one could wander at pleasure among its beautiful ruined arches, covered with their soft garment of moss and lichen. Sunday afternoons were often spent there reading, in sight of the blue waters of the Sound, the red granite rocks of Mull and the distant Paps of Jura. In a lecture my Father wrote for his people at Aberynte he says, "No sight I know so fills the mind with the sense of beauty as to sail among these islands when the sea is blue and the rocks stand out of it, clear and bright in the sunshine. The hallowed associations of these seas over which the first missionaries sailed in their frail coracles, bringing to this land the first rudiments of a civilization which has advanced so far and is, we trust, advancing still, suggest many thoughts and many an impulse to public effort and personal devotion."

My Father was already collecting material for his *History of Religion*, which he had been asked to write for Mr. Murray's series of *University Extension Manuals*. Four summers at Iona were spent in preparation for this book. In 1890 he made a short tour of the old towns in Brittany with my Mother, and in 1891 they sailed up the Scheldt, and so by Brussels, Namur, and Luxembourg to Trier, where they had gone to be present at the Festival of the Holy Coat. In 1892, leaving his family at Iona, my Father went to Bonn to work at his *History of Religion*. He was there for more than a month, and came home satisfied with the work done, though he was then

only at the beginning of his labours on that book, which necessitated immense research and reading. The librarians at Bonn University Library gave him every facility for his work, and many of the Professors there helped in every way open to them.

In 1893, owing to the death of Principal Cunningham just at the commencement of the winter session, Professor Birrell and my Father were called upon to undertake the teaching of the Divinity Class. This was comparatively easy for him, in that much of his work for his *History of Religion* had taken him over the ground which was to be covered in the Divinity Class.

There was a portrait of him in *College Echoes* that winter, with the following appreciative account of his work. "His students feel at once that he lectures in no traditional, stereotyped fashion. Every sentence is a force. It is a perfect pleasure to watch the development of his argument, and when the conclusion is reached one feels that there is little more to be said. Not the least interesting part of the lecture is when the Professor directs his gaze far beyond the College orchard and the right index finger is raised to assist the clinching of the argument. It is a mistake to take notes then, for if you watch the Professor you cannot possibly forget such passages. A quiet sarcastic humour does much to enliven the daily task. The following is a fair specimen—'The next verse, gentlemen, is said to have an interpretation for every day of the week, so we will leave it till to-morrow.' Professor Menzies has always been a kind friend to the members of his own class, and it is well known that any scheme which tends to benefit the students has his warm and influential support. He is one of the Honorary Vice-Presidents of

the University Golf Club, and is also a member of the Union Governing Board. He has always taken an active interest in the Theological and Missionary Societies, and two winters ago delivered the Professorial Address to the Union Debating Society. He is ever willing to give words of advice and encouragement, though in no instance are they thrust upon anyone. Nor does his interest cease with the close of a student's College career, for he is always glad to hear of subsequent success. Long may he continue a Professor in St. Mary's College."

Another tribute to his teaching, which he received from an old student, the Rev. Donald Fergusson, late minister of Inverkeithing, has already appeared in print in a volume published after the death of that gifted young minister.[1] He speaks of the object and occasion of his writing. It was partly, he says, "to endeavour in a humble way to express the gratitude I felt for the teaching and stimulus which I had received in the classes you conducted. It is not likely that I would ever have attempted this letter had I not happened to read a certain passage from the pen of an American writer which stirred me up and pointed me to the course which I now adopt."

"I quote a sentence: 'And if people do help you, since there is no sure way of finding it out, tell them so, and give them courage and strength that they may bear up and go on helping still to the end.' While I have nothing to shew except my gratitude for the benefit which I have received at your hands, yet I cannot keep from expressing my thanks. Time and again it has been on my lips, and has itched at the point of my pen, but that peculiarly

[1] *A Student of Nature.* Memorials of the late Rev. Donald Fergusson, M.A. Gardner, Paisley, 1898.

Scoto-Celtic characteristic—dour reticence—has hitherto been too much for me."

"I may also state, since I have begun to unburden myself, that to my certain knowledge the influence from your Chair at St. Andrews will ever be remembered for good by many of your former students. You opened up for us a new world of thought, and I myself have learned to think out things for myself according to my ability."

"A certain 'bunk' in St. Andrews, after Sunday evening service, used to hold a band of budding thinkers—sometimes, and not unfortunately, to the number of thirteen—met to discuss 'various questions in religion,' but in reality your lectures for the week. Often after a lively play of tongues our speculations seemed vain and useless, but the results are beginning to shew themselves in more than one quarter. I will not attempt to detail the various ways in which your influence has been felt; it might take too long, and I am not sure that, for my own part, I could put my finger on any spot and say, 'There it stops.'"

"I only strive to relieve myself in a half-intelligent way of what seems due to you, and remain with every cordial wish,

Yours very sincerely,

DONALD FERGUSSON."

This letter gave real satisfaction to my Father, and he wrote in reply, ". . . I scarcely know how to thank you. I do so at any rate heartily for the encouragement you give me in my work. It will indeed help me to believe that the Biblical Criticism Class is of use, especially to the brighter minds among the students, and that it makes it easier for them than it was for me to find the way through the jungles, and not to be buried in the maze."

In the winters of 1894-95 and 1895-96 he gave a set of Lectures to the Young Men's Guild on Sunday mornings. He called them *Lessons on the Gospel History*, and had a syllabus printed, so that his hearers could prepare beforehand the subject he was to treat each Sunday. In the two subsequent years he was asked to give a set of public lectures on Sunday afternoons. The first year he lectured on the *New Testament Canon*, and the second on the *Teaching of Jesus*. He found great pleasure in these lectures. For nothing pleased him more than to find people interested in the Bible and anxious to learn more about it.

After a working holiday at Iona in 1894, my Father and Mother went for a few days to Nürnberg, which he knew already as a boy, and then on to Bayreuth for the Musical Festival. He wrote an account of it for a daily paper, from which these extracts are taken. (The musical side of the question is omitted, as it is the philosophy of Wagner—a student of Nietzsche—that is of interest here.)

"The hearing of a Wagner Opera is not a mere evening's amusement, but a solid half-day's work ; and, if we include the time for preparation necessary for intelligent hearing, a great deal more. Opera with Wagner has in it no element of levity ; it is not the elegant recreation of a Court, but the serious occupation of patriots, demanding time and labour, earnestness and concentration. It is a wonderful work Wagner has done, looking to no more than the outward features of it. He has created an Opera differing in many respects from all that went before, not only in its music, but in its words, in its scenery, in its spirit and tendency, in the temper with which it is given and that in which it is received."

" Wagner's admirers claim for him the rank of a great

poet. He spent years in the composition of the words of his operas, engaging in deep antiquarian research into the themes which he selected and pondering deeply their dramatic possibilities. It was his ambition to produce works which should be to Germany what the works of the great tragedians were to Greece, and the performance of which should be like that of the great Greek tragedies, stimulative of patriotic and religious sentiment." After discussing the sources of the dramas and Wagner's treatment of them, the article concludes, "It is not to be denied that there are passages of great literary beauty; snatches of pure and liquid song occur, by which the German language is enriched, but, on the whole, the serious dramas are heavy, sentimental, undramatic—nay, depressing. None but Germans could possibly digest them; if they live, it will be by the music holding them above the waves. They are inspired by a philosophy which is not destined to endure; which cannot be the ultimate philosophy of Germany, far less of Europe."

After Bayreuth, the Professor returned to his old quarters at Bonn, my Mother returning to Scotland, home and children. From the year 1891, when he first began to work at his *History of Religion*, it occupied his time and thoughts in every working moment not devoted to his class-work. He wrote home about it to his wife, "I am happy and at ease about the book. I hope you will regard it with pleasure too, though it took me away from Iona to Bonn and kept me in Germany last year. I believe it will have a great influence, and bring guidance and courage to many." The book appeared in the spring of 1895. The following extract from the Preface gives some idea of its purpose.

"This book makes no pretence to be a guide to all the

mythologies or to all the religious practices which have prevailed in the world. It is intended to aid the student who desires to obtain a general idea of comparative religion by exhibiting the subject as a connected and organic whole, and by indicating the leading points of view from which each of the great systems may be best understood. A certain amount of discussion is employed in order to bring clearly before the reader the great motives and ideas by which the various religions are inspired and the movements of thought which they represent. And the attempt is made to exhibit the great manifestations of human piety in their genealogical connection. The writer has ventured to deal with the religions of the Bible, each in its proper historical place, and trusts that he has not, by so doing, rendered any disservice either to Christian faith or to the science of religion. It is obvious that in a work claiming to be scientific and appealing to men of every faith, all religions must be treated impartially, and that the same method must be applied to each of them."

The book soon went through its first and second editions; the second edition was five times reprinted; a third edition was published in 1908, and in 1911 a revised edition was brought out, in larger type and with additional notes and references. "The book was well known in many lands"—to quote from an article in *College Echoes*—"and was selected by Berlin scholars for translation into German, on the ground that nothing better could be said on the subject."

Professor John Burnet (who succeeded Lewis Campbell in the Greek Chair at St. Andrews) has written some reminiscences of his colleague, and as they deal largely with the *History of Religion*, they may fitly be given here.

"I think," says Professor Burnet, "what strikes me most about Allan Menzies is that he was a type of man not too common in Scotland at the present day, the churchman who is primarily a scholar. His sermons were curiously like those of Jowett in their simplicity of language and their occasional touches of dry humour. Anyone could understand them, but few could appreciate what such simplicity costs. His teaching, from all accounts of it, was marked by the same quality.

"His task of late years was a hard one. For some time before his death most of the students who came to his Class were practically ignorant of Greek, and he thus found his work much increased. It would not be made easier by the fact that there was also a sprinkling of good Greek scholars, who had to be taught with the rest. It might have seemed a hopeless thing to make such a Class take an interest in the new light that has been thrown of late on the language and criticism of the New Testament, and the temptation to neglect the bulk of the Class and to concentrate on the few who were adequately prepared must have been great. That, however, was impossible for a man like Menzies, and he somehow achieved what might have seemed impossible. It was in large measure, I think, his personality which enabled him to do this. Everyone who came in contact with him felt that he was a Christian, a gentleman and a scholar, and that is a combination that rarely fails to impress young men.

"His real subject, I take it, was rather what is usually called the Science of Religion than Criticism, whether higher or lower, and I think his book on the *History of Religion* contains more of his mind than anything else he wrote. If we consider the shifting character of the foundations on which such a study has to be built and the

curious lack of sobriety displayed by many of its most distinguished exponents, we cannot fail to appreciate the merits of this unpretending volume. It is astonishing how little it has been antiquated by later work, and the chapter on Roman religion in particular is a marvel for the time at which it was written. It is noteworthy, too, how little effect certain theories, which were very fashionable when he wrote, were allowed to have on his treatment of the religion of Zarathustra. I suppose his account of it was considered old-fashioned at the time it was written; though, just for that reason, it is still an admirable introduction to the subject.

"But, when all is said, Allan Menzies was far greater even than his best work, and it is impossible for those who did not know him to understand what manner of man he was. He seemed to carry an atmosphere of scholarship and piety about with him, and that was a far greater educational influence than anything he said or wrote could be. A unique personality like his cannot be replaced, but it remains as a real influence with all who came under its spell.

"Menzies owed much to the Germany of other days, and this gave a special poignancy to his feelings about the war. It is true in general, I think, that those who have been most influenced by Germany in the past are least able to condone the offence against Western civilisation of which that nation has been guilty. It was certainly so with him. Younger men, who only know the Germany of recent years, might regard what has happened as perfectly natural, but to him it seemed monstrous. He was in the fullest sense a 'good European,' and the cause of the Allies seemed to him a sacred one.

"I shall not easily forget one morning early in the war

when he was reading prayers in our Chapel, and when, after the prayer for the King, he added an intercession for the rulers of the allied nations, from the President of the French Republic to the King of Montenegro, all of whom he mentioned by name. He told me once that the events of to-day gave a new meaning to the apocalyptic literature, which he knew so well, and he had faith in the coming of a better time."

In the spring of 1895, after my Father had seen this book through the Press and was tired from the heavy strain it had involved, his brother Robert—ever the doer of kind deeds—took him to Italy.

He wrote many interesting letters home from this tour. In one of the first of them he says, "I am feeling that I shall be quite ready when I get home to sit down to work, and have got some notion what I ought to aim at." On leaving Rome for Florence, he says, "I shall have suffered a real grief on leaving this place. Its sun and air, its fountains, its gaiety and, above all, its art, conveying the highest thoughts of men long dead in this and other lands, all have made me very happy. It is to be counted on the other side that I shall be travelling towards you." And of Florence he says, "It is thought to be a dull and quiet place by those who come to it from Rome, and one is advised to see Florence first. The places cannot be compared. In Rome a number of different interests compete, and it is a noisy, bustling capital with a more southern climate. The history of Rome is that of the Roman Empire and then that of the Popes. The latter meet one at every corner; wherever there is a gateway or a bridge or a church, it has an inscription claiming for a Pope the credit of it. The streets swarm with priests and monks,

celebrations are going on everywhere. Florence is a town made by its own citizens under enlightened rulers, and has always been a home of enlightened intellect and freedom. There is one great subject of interest, with hardly anything to compete with it, namely the school of art. Nowhere that I know of can one see in galleries as here the rise of art, from conventional forms to the highest independence and vigour. I was this morning in the Academy of the Fine Arts, which is entirely devoted to the Florentine School, and well arranged for study. Cimabue is the oldest named painter, then Giotto, his pupil, then come the Gaddis, and to jump to the end, Perugino, the master of Raphael, Lippo Lippi, Andrea del Sarto, Botticelli. I am not sure of the order, but that does not much matter. You see nature gradually asserting herself in art, gold halos growing dim and disappearing, while the faces become more human and beautiful, and cease to droop to the shoulder; landscape creeping in, etc."

"April 19. Spent the morning in the monastery of San Marco, where Savonarola was a monk, and which was beautified by Fra Angelico and his pupils. It is a heavenly kind of place, beautiful forms of sweet, grave men and women stand on the walls in every corner. There is a cloister, not in ruins like those of St. Andrews and Iona, but perfect, and with frescoes on the inner walls, mostly in perfect preservation. One of two monks meeting Christ as a pilgrim, is on a little panel not eighteen inches broad, very charming; they are all taking the most profound and delicate interest in each other, heads slightly bent forward, faces full of tenderness. Another picture is of a company of monks sitting at table for a meal. But there is no food on the table, the plates and glasses are all empty. Two angels, however, have come in, with baskets, one full of

biscuits, the other not shewing its contents, the monks not betraying any avidity for these supplies, but all quite peaceful and happy, even without bread, and by that very fact deserving it.

"Upstairs the monks' cells are open to the visitor; they are small square rooms with narrow windows. No monks live here now. Beside each window, on the dark side by day, there is a fresco drawing, some of these by Fra Angelico, and all of exquisite beauty. He had some ladies to paint from, not many, for the same face occurs again and again, but they are angelic women, noble, stately, tender-hearted, devout. A *Coronation of the Virgin* haunts the memory, and a *Resurrection, with the Women.* There are some miniatures painted on a gold ground, ideals of beauty. One wonders what the monk's life was when this painting was going on, and the brethren got these pictures to kneel to in their cells after daylight.

"The great galleries are very different places from either of these. There, stars of the first magnitude from every quarter may be seen together, and there is not much historical arrangement for the student who wishes to get his impressions in order. Quite overwhelming is the effect of finding great pictures by Perugino, Andrea del Sarto, Raffaele, Titian, Rubens, Murillo, all close together; one comes away confused, and convinced that to know art is quite impossible.

"These galleries are joined together by an immensely long gallery, which crosses the Arno on the top of the jewellers' shops of the Ponte Vecchio, and has rows of portraits all the way—half a mile, say; portraits of Popes, of all the Medicis many times over, of all the Kings of France, of Spain, most of those of England, and princes and kings' nephews and cousins without number. A long

climb down at one end and up at the other makes this pleasure perfect!

"If I lived here awhile, I would get to understand about art. But I won't come again, save you are with me. . . . I hope that all goes well. Your letter, which I look for to-morrow, will tell me, and perhaps there will be a *Scotsman* review in it. . . . But I am not very anxious. I know the book is good, and will be useful, whatever he may say."

In 1896 Allan Menzies edited a supplementary volume of *The Ante-Nicene Church Fathers*, to complete a series which had been begun in 1866 by Sir James Donaldson. The series ran to twenty-four volumes, and has been of great use to theological study in Great Britain and America.

That year he and his wife took their elder daughter to school in Germany, and themselves spent a month in the Odenwald, where he was preparing for his winter's work and planning his Commentary on the *Earliest Gospel*. When, in the spring of 1897, their younger daughter also went to school in Heidelberg, the house at St. Andrews was let for several years, and the Professor and his wife were thus free to spend their summers abroad. Heidelberg was for some years their headquarters, and there the Professor met with the greatest kindness and consideration from the University Librarians, who gave him every facility for his work. When the daughters had their summer holidays, the family went to small, out of the way places in Switzerland, where he got a great deal of work done.

In 1897 Allan Menzies was elected President of the National Church Union, whose motto was "The letter

killeth but the spirit giveth life," and whose main purpose was to convince the Church that it must continue to advance in Christian thought as well as in good works. At the meeting in which this Society was founded, the President, after the preliminary business was over, gave an address, in which he said that the aims of the Society had, on the whole, been well received. Even in the least-expected quarters it had been recognised that there was need for such a Society. He then went on to state what he conceived that necessity to be, in obedience to which they acted and proposed still further to act.

'The Church of Scotland,' he said, 'enjoyed till lately the reputation of being a singularly broad and liberal-minded community of Christians. It was under the influence of a succession of great men that the Church, which in the middle of the century was narrow enough, became so wide and comprehensive. In that building (the Old Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh) they could not help thinking of Dr. Robert Lee. They also remembered the manly form of Principal Tulloch, the keen courage of Principal Cunningham, and others there were whose names might be mentioned. They fought a good fight, and owing to their efforts they, who favoured a liberal construction of Christianity, were able to feel that the Church wished them to be free, and allowed them to make use of their freedom as far as was consistent with the constitutional limits imposed upon them. That was one of the strongest reasons why they loved their Church, and he believed also why the country loved and respected her. These great men had been taken away from them, and he thought he was quite within the bounds of truth when he said that the love of theological freedom was not so strongly represented now in the higher quarters of the

Church as it formerly was. Theological freedom was as necessary for Scotland and for the Church of Scotland as it ever was. Every Church, especially every national Church, must cherish freedom of religious thought. A Church to guide the nation in religious matters must be looking at religious problems freshly. Ministers who were not only to be priests administering fixed rites, but who were to partake to some extent of the character of prophets and deliver to their people a living message, must be free in their studies. They must apply themselves to the problem how the everlasting truths of religion were to be brought freshly to bear on the changing circumstances of the country. If the Church did not allow freedom of religious thought and discussion, the consequence was—there were abundant instances to prove it—that the thoughtful, intelligent laity lost confidence in her. Now they were face to face with a phenomenon which was new in their experience in the Church of Scotland—with a very marked, a very distinct intolerance of theological movement. It came to them not only from one side, but from more than one. There was a very active, strong, pushing party in their Church, who conscientiously held the view that the Church was already in possession of all the truth she needed, and that there was no need for theological inquiry. They did not find fault with those who held these views—they held them conscientiously and acted upon them with courage, and they respected them for it; but if their views could be carried out, the consequence would be that the study of theology would be stifled in the country. The only branch of theology that could survive, if their influence prevailed, would be that of Church history and antiquities. There was that active party, who were on principle opposed to theological move-

ment, and when they looked about and inquired what force there was in the Church to check that threatening danger, they were somewhat at a loss what to reply. There were many in the Church who did not at all sympathise with that way of thinking which he had described, but who yet were not actively in favour of theological progress. They did not want things to move quickly in the Church; they wished things to be kept quiet. They did not want questions to be stirred; they were for keeping the Church as outwardly united and harmonious as possible; and so they spoke with sneers and contempt of Biblical criticism—a fault which they would not expect that he could look upon lightly.

'These, then, were the circumstances under which they were placed. They considered that the free study of theology in Scotland was threatened by great dangers; the great men who used to lead those of their way of thinking had been taken away from them. What remained? It was the view of the Committee, whose report he now laid before them, that they were called to make up by union what they had lost in leaders; to stand shoulder to shoulder and to declare by the fact of their Association that they did not want the study of theology to come to an end in Scotland. They considered that the study of Biblical Criticism and the statement of the results of Biblical Criticism, not only from University Chairs, but to a certain extent also from pulpits, was not wrong but right. They considered that light and not darkness was the proper element of the life of Christianity. They considered that truth and not tradition ought to be the watchword of the Church. And so the Committee had, not without a grave sense of responsibility, drawn up the Constitution which he now laid before them. They said

in the first clause, that in certain parts of their work they should be prepared to welcome the co-operation of members of other Churches who sympathised with their views and objects. They recognised that the movement of theological growth, which they wanted to continue and not to be arrested, was not confined to their Church. Other Churches had done as much for it, he was free to confess had done more for it, than the Church of Scotland. They recognised that the movement which they desired to encourage was not a Church movement, but a national one, and they saw in that fact a possible point of union between men of different Churches in the future. The second clause of the Constitution was that which had drawn upon it most criticism. They said in that clause that the Union was intended to maintain the right and the duty of free theological inquiry in Scotland. It had appeared to many that in these words they had claimed more than they were entitled to claim, because the ministers of the Church of Scotland were not entitled to carry on an altogether free theological inquiry. They had recognised that fact; they had always recognised the fact that their statutory position imposed limits upon them. They did not say that these limits were right. On the contrary, he supposed that every one who joined the Union would bring with him the conviction that the position in which the ministers of the Church of Scotland stood to her creed admitted of great improvement,—that ministers ought not to be tied, to the extent to which they were, to a creed composed two centuries ago. That was not new. In the year 1864, when he entered the Divinity Hall, the first lecture he heard was one by Dr. Robert Lee, in which he attacked the position in which subscription stood in the Church of Scotland in far more sweeping and scathing

terms than he would venture to use. Then in the end of the second clause they said that they hoped to enter into the discussion of social questions. They did not need to give any excuse for that. The Church of Scotland herself had set them the example by her inquiry into the religious condition of the people, and had pointed out to them the social field as one in which Christian men might well labour. After all, theology was not the whole of life, and the defence of a free theology was not, perhaps, in itself a sufficient end of existence. They required also to do something practical for others—to do something for the general welfare. It was not his part to say anything to discourage them, but he would like to say that the Committee had gone through this piece of work with a great feeling of responsibility, and that they did not expect that they would at once carry all things before them. Their numbers, perhaps, might not be very large, and they might have much gainsaying and misrepresentation to encounter. But they had set before them a great end. They had resolved to do what they could to keep the Church of Scotland worthy of an intelligent and truth-loving nation. If they could do anything to promote that end, they might well bear with cheerfulness any personal trial that was entailed upon themselves. If the Union was formed, and if they carried it out with modesty and good temper in a constitutional way—not attacking others, not using the liberty they claimed as a cloak for licentiousness in words, but seeking in love to serve their Church and country—then he believed that their cause would prosper, that they should find that they had leaders, and that ere long their affairs might reach such a pass that they might come to the conclusion that their Union had served its end and might be dissolved.'

At the first Conference of the National Church Union, the President read a paper on the *Social Office of Religion*, and at the second, in 1899, on *The Accounts in the New Testament of the Lord's Supper.*

From 1895 to 1901 my Father devoted himself to his Commentary on Mark. He continued his visits to Iona, and spent a part of each summer abroad, sometimes at Heidelberg, sometimes at Schwyz, a little Swiss town at the foot of the Great Mythen. He and his wife lived there for several summers in an old *Reding-Haus*, converted into a hotel. They were generally the only guests, and had lofty, palatial rooms to themselves. Schwyz is a quiet little place, and gave admirable opportunity for reading and writing. From there the pilgrimage town of Einsiedeln was visited, famous for its wonder-working image of the Virgin; and although my Father talked of these pilgrimages with a twinkle in his eye, he saw much to be admired in the whole-hearted devotion of the pilgrims, their self-sacrifice and not seldom their suffering of hardship in order to find ways and means to make these pilgrimages. The district around Schwyz was Catholic, and at every junction of roads and along every mountain path one would come upon a wayside chapel or a shrine with a crucifix. And that aspect of Catholic religious usage appealed strongly to my Father—that the people made outward expression of their faith and desired to remind themselves everywhere they went of the goodness of God. He could never see a chapel without going in to it; no devout Catholic more devout than he.

He also paid a visit to Zürich to see Professor Paul Schmiedel, with whom he had long corresponded. Both were working at the Epistles of St. Paul and the questions and lines of thought connected therewith. They spent a

long day together walking about Zürich, up its steep streets, through its University, past its statue of Zwingli, the Swiss reformer, talking theology all the time.

Another favourite place for working, where the family spent several summers, was Ringgenberg, on the Lake of Brienz. The primitive old Swiss house where they stayed had once been a mill, and had all along one side a low "Gallerie" festooned with grape vines and giving a beautiful view across the lake to the mountains beyond. The landlord was induced to allow breakfast and supper to be brought there, and at one end my Father had his writing table, and spent many happy weeks immersed in his work. He did a good deal of reviewing from time to time for the *Athenaeum*, the *Hibbert Journal*, *Mind* and, of course, for his own *Review of Theology* when it came into being a few years later. At Ringgenberg, as at all his other haunts, he always went for a walk after tea, but was seldom to be lured from his books before that. There was another visit to the Musical Festival at Bayreuth in 1899, and on their way to join their daughters my parents visited the Wartburg, and stayed for some time in the Bavarian highlands.

In 1901 Messrs. Macmillan published his Commentary on Mark, *The Earliest Gospel*. In his Preface he says, "It is written with a profound conviction that as criticism declares the second Gospel to be the porch by which we must go in to find the Saviour as he was and is, the earnest reader of that Gospel may indeed find him here. For his teaching, it is true, we have to look elsewhere; and his figure as here disclosed is homelier and more subject to human limitations than that to which we are accustomed. But though more human, it need not be less divine." And in his Introduction, he adds, "I would not conceal

my belief that the face of Jesus, as he actually was and spoke, strove and suffered, lived and trusted and hoped, has been to a large extent hidden from us by the theology we have inherited; nor my conviction that as earnest and truthful study reveals again his features, his spirit will enter with fresh energy into the life of his followers."

1902 saw the appearance of a small book on the *Religions of India* for Dent's *Temple Series of Bible Handbooks*. It was a tantalising bit of work, as the space allowed was limited. The writer says in his Preface, "No doubt it is impossible to treat the whole of the subject in our limits . . . but the same is true of any religion. . . . When asked to give an account of the religion of India in a small volume, we must turn to the origins and try to furnish some short statement of that which lies at the beginning of Indian Faith, of that to which believers in India naturally turn, as Christians do to the facts and doctrines recorded in the Gospels. . . . In no other land can the successive ages of religion, as it grows from infancy to manly strength and then to weakness and decay, be so well seen; and it is this that makes Indian religion so important to the student of the world's faiths and so full of lessons of the greatest moment to all who care in a broad and generous way for human faith and piety."

In 1903 he wrote an article on the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* for Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (Vol. v., pp. 338-343).

My Father suffered a great deal from neuralgia that year, and writes in his Journal, "Barbarous torture. Does it do any good?" The autumn was spent at Thun in the old Swiss Hotel Freienhof, which became from that time one of the favourite haunts of himself and his family. His sister Helen, who visited him there, wrote afterwards,

"I have a very delightful picture of your life at Thun. Your breakfast table under the trees, your windows looking away over the blue river to the snowy mountains, and the dear Professor sitting reading his Thessalonians in the shade beside the rushing water."

On the way home a Sunday was spent in Paris. The Professor had only one day to spare, and thought it would be a good plan to take a drive round the town. Someone suggested Cook's omnibus as being the best way of having a peaceful afternoon, free from the trouble of giving directions to the driver. Accordingly we climbed into the first 'bus that came along. It was soon filled by a curious collection of passengers, all of them men and all of them manifestly doubtful characters. The 'bus drove through street after street, dull as only Paris streets know how to be dull. It was becoming evident that something was wrong, when the driver wheeled round into an enclosure surrounded by booths of some sort, and the Divinity Professor from sober Scotland found that he had conducted his family, and that, on the Lord's Day, to the racecourse at Longchamps.

That was the year of my parents' silver-wedding, and in the autumn their [redacted] and sisters came to St. Andrews to present the portrait of my Mother, painted for the occasion by Charles Sims, R.A. There was a festive banquet and many flattering speeches.

In 1905 the *Review of Theology and Philosophy* was begun. It was intended to carry on the work of the *Critical Review*, which had ceased to appear, and was published under the auspices of the Divinity faculty at St. Andrews. My Father was appointed editor. Its purpose—as its name implied—was solely that of furnishing reliable and competent reviews of theological and philo-

sophical publications. The Editor enjoyed the task, although it took up much of his time and lessened the output of his original work for the following years. As a jocular writer in *College Echoes* said, he had to "keep an eye on the two hemispheres and watch the advent of all new books. Whenever a new book appears with wise thoughts about God or man, our Editor is ready to receive it hospitably and to find many friends for it."

The *Review* naturally brought him into close touch with the most eminent theological and philosophical scholars of Great Britain and America. He also corresponded with many German theologians and some French, in particular with Loisy. In these and in other ways he felt the value and use of the *Review*, and it was with great regret that, in 1915, owing to the war and the consequent lack of new books in theology and philosophy, he was forced to suspend its publication. It was not a financial success—publications of that kind never are; but there can be no doubt that it was of use, and he hoped that someone else would be found in after years willing to give the time and energy to continue it.

August 1905 saw the family at Ringenberg, where my Father was busy revising his [illegible] *of Religion* for a new edition, and in 1906 he and my Mother had a short Italian holiday, staying chiefly at Orvieto, Perugia and Assisi, and coming home in time to take part in the George Buchanan Celebrations at St. Andrews.

For the Memorial Volume of that Festival my Father wrote an article on Buchanan's translation of the Psalms and the eighteenth century controversy as to whether Buchanan's translation or that of Arthur Johnston, afterwards Rector of Aberdeen University, was the best. He was deeply interested in the subject, but had little time to

devote to it. He closes his paper with these words, "One leaves this subject with a strong desire that the Latin Psalms of Scotland, which form so interesting a part of our national inheritance, may not be forgotten, and that the power to appreciate them may not be diminished or lost in the country which produced them."

The 8th of August that same year was the Centenary of his Mother's birth, and the brothers and sisters—their ranks now sadly thinned—came to St. Andrews to do honour to her memory. My Father had invited them all to meet at Stuttgart, but that was found to be impossible, and the evening—full of reminiscences of these early days in Germany—was spent at St. Andrews instead.

It was in the autumn of that year that Morning Prayers in the Chapel were first instituted. These morning services were a great satisfaction to my Father; he wrote many new prayers for them, and although on wet mornings the attendance was small, his service was always prepared with the same care. "He realised how much the students needed common worship," writes Professor Lawson, "and he had a strong sense of his duty to them in this aspect of their University life." He was pleased when in later years these services became better attended; in his last session there were generally between fifty and sixty present every morning.

The Rev. George Gordon Stott, minister of Cramond, and one of my Father's first students, has given us some impressions of his Professor, and as they close with a reference to Morning Prayers, we give them here.

"At three separate periods," he writes, "I had the good fortune to be in close touch with the late Professor Menzies. Twenty-five years ago I entered St. Mary's College, and following a somewhat unusual course, I took the Class

of Biblical Criticism at once. For three years I was a member of this Class under Professor Menzies. They were very happy and fruitful years. We loved the man. We reverenced the teacher. We welcomed the message. There was always something fascinating in that class. I see the Professor now as he stood at his desk. He has just unfolded a recent theory of a famous German, concerning the book of the Acts of the Apostles. He has done ample justice to the wondrous erudition of the Teutonic mind, and we begin to feel that the problem has been finally solved; that the last word has been said.

"Then our Professor pauses. A curious gleam comes into his eyes as they seem to wander for a moment away over the College Quadrangle. His forefinger is raised, and we know that he has found the flaw in what seemed a flawless argument. 'Professor S—— lacks imagination.' A simple sentence, simply spoken, yet the words ring in my ears to-day, after a quarter of a century, an indictment not of a German Professor on a point of theology, but of the whole German nation in its attitude towards the world.

"Yet Professor Menzies w[illegible]nservative in theology. He followed the truth fearlessly. He welcomed gladly, almost eagerly, every gleam of new light which recent study has thrown upon Bible problems. He did not believe that the most searching criticism could ever dim the glory of the sacred page.

"And other gifts than those of scholarship made him a delightful guide to students in the field of New Testament study. He had a keen sense of values; he had a steadfast integrity of purpose. Above all, no man ever had a deeper reverence or a firmer faith in the things that cannot

be shaken. Such gifts combined to make him not only an attractive personality, but a teacher revered and beloved by every generation of students. He gave them more than instruction, he gave them character. And that character stamped itself upon them unconsciously, ineffaceably. To-day it is reflected in many a manse and pulpit throughout Scotland in this grim crisis.

"On a second occasion I was brought in contact with Professor Menzies, when later I revisited St. Andrews as an examiner in Theology. For seven years I held this appointment, and saw much of Professor Menzies. The years seemed to touch him lightly. There was the same buoyancy of spirit, the same affectionate interest in the welfare of his students, the same genial welcome to the hospitality of his kindly home.

"But specially I shall always recall his kindness when, in the session of 1914-15, I undertook the work of the Hebrew Chair in St. Mary's College, in the absence of Professor Kay, on active service as Chaplain to the Forces. Never shall I forget how on the first morning of the term, before the classes met, he came into the retiring room. He spoke only [redacted]ds. But the old days lived again. The old affecti[redacted] much-loved teacher was stirred, and I knew that in any difficulty I had with me a sure friend and counsellor.

"In these last days we talked often of the great war. Professor Menzies had been reared in Germany, and was steeped in German theology. The tragedy of Europe's agony hurt him sorely. Yet his faith in the future never faltered. German Militarism must be crushed. 'It will be a long process,' he would say, 'they are trained in the art of war. We are not. But we must win.'

"All through the years he never lost the saving grace of

humour. He delighted in a quiet jest, even at the expense of a colleague. But in his humour there was no sting of malice, no trace of bitterness. His was the love that thinketh no evil.

"My last and perhaps the most abiding impression is that I shared the privilege of worshipping in the University Chapel when Professor Menzies read Morning Prayers 'in time of war.' To these prayers he gave diligent preparation and much thought. The result was an impressive service, beautiful in its simplicity. We were made to feel that we were only little children, blind and ignorant. But above and around us every day was an infinitely wise and loving God, in whose hands were all the issues of life and death, of time and eternity. Around us the tempest of war might surge, shaking the world, but within the heart of everyone that looked for it in humble faith was the true Kingdom which could not be moved. No enemy could daunt, no sorrow overwhelm those who thus believed. Here perhaps, as nowhere else, will Professor Menzies always seem to me to stand revealed—a man of great learning and brilliant intellect, yet with an intensely human sympathy and with the heart of a child. Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

In this year, 1906, Allan Menzies wrote articles on the *History of the Church of Scotland* for the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. His mind was much occupied with the question of Creed Revision in Scotland, and he wrote on that subject in the *Nation* and in the *Glasgow Herald*. His point of view was that ministers of the Church of Scotland should not be obliged to subscribe to the Confession of Faith as the expression of their own personal faith; that they should not be required to

treat the Confession as a final statement of what is in the Bible, but must be allowed to work towards a better. "We must be allowed," he said, "to adhere to the Confession because it is the last Creed the Church adopted, but in the hope that in due time the Church will be able to leave it behind her." He had already, in 1898, taken part in a debate in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, on an Overture from the Presbytery of Stranraer, asking for relaxation of Subscription to the Confession of Faith. Part of his speech must be quoted here to show how deeply the question affected him. Supporting a motion of Dr. Story's, pleading for relaxation, my Father closed his remarks thus, "In order that we may arrive at the truth on these great matters (the nature of the Bible and the Teaching of Christ), it is necessary first of all, that theology should be free. In Scotland especially free theological discussion is an urgent necessity. That, I believe, is what the Church of Scotland needs more than anything else at the present time (1898). Our Church has not till now taken her proper share of the great work of the development of theology which is carried on by the Protestant Churches which [illegible] atural allies. How little do we contribute to the [illegible] of Christian thought! There is no theological magazine connected with our Church in which a young man may set forth the result of his studies and may also find himself corrected if he has gone wrong. Among our multitudinous Committees, there is not one that exists for the promotion of scientific theology. Books of theology are published in our Church; but how few books which in any degree guide Christian thought! If a book should be published which does not strictly conform to the traditional views of the Church, we know that it meets with very little thanks. Now this ought to be

changed. The Church ought to encourage theological discussion, and not to seek to stifle it. Those who carry on such discussion should be regarded as the friends, not the assailants of the Church. I trust that things will move in this direction among us. I hope to see the day when the ministers of the Church of Scotland will be at liberty to say what they think on theological questions. And it is with this view that I second Dr. Story's motion. I shall regard its passing not only as a step towards the boon it craves, but as a declaration on the part of the Church of a policy of toleration and comprehension. It will mark, in my opinion, the dawn of a happier and brighter day for the Church and the country. When it is understood that ministers are free to speak what they think, many things will grow better with us. The people will come better to church. The schemes will be more heartily supported when more intelligence is directed to the principles on which they proceed, and people understand more clearly what they are being asked to do. The Church will be an object of wider and more profound affection when she is regarded as the home not only of Christian life and work, but also of Christian thought."

It will be seen from this qu[redacted]der what limitations and discouragements my Father's own work had been done. It is remembered that one of his own books was decried from the Moderator's Chair one year, not openly, but so that there was no doubt what was meant. It surprised my Father not a little to hear afterwards that the book had not been read by him who criticised it. He rather enjoyed the humour of the situation when he wrote to the Moderator, enclosing a copy of the book in question, saying, "I was interested to hear your opinion of this book before you had read it, and shall be even more

interested to know what you think of it *after* you have read it."

In 1907 and 1908 his literary activities included an exhaustive *Survey of Recent Literature on the Synoptic Gospels and the Life of Jesus* for the *Review of Theology*, and an article for a German publication, *Protestantismus im XIXten Jahrhundert*. He collaborated with Professor Herkless on the article upon the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland for this sumptuous book. During these years his class lectures dealt with the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and the work thus done formed a nucleus for his Commentary on that book, which was published in 1912.

In 1908 my Father was Chairman at the Annual Breakfast of the Church Service Society, of which he had been a member since 1874. In his address he said, "If I thought that the purpose of this Society was to provide the Church with a Liturgy, I might not long remain a member of it. The Church may come herself to ask for a Liturgy; in the meantime it lies with individual ministers of the Church to see that the devotions they conduct are as true and as beautiful as it is possible to make them. That responsibility lies on individual ministers, and the people of Scotland will be slow to relieve them of it. The presentation of a public Liturgy to the Church of Scotland would be a very risky undertaking, from whatever quarter it might come. This conviction I have long held, and my conviction has been strengthened very much by the series of volumes which has proceeded from this Society, the little volumes on the Liturgies prepared for use in the Church of Scotland since the Reformation. These books are very valuable for the study of Church History, and give a well-grounded and

substantial account of the public prayers of our country. The Editors of these are worthy of our best thanks. It strikes one very forcibly that the task of furnishing the Church of Scotland with a Liturgy is scarcely within the compass of human powers. Great authorities, Reformers, Archbishops and Bishops, both in our Church and the English Church, have tried it. Monarchs have tried it, Assemblies of Divines also tried it. None of these attempts proved successful. Great mistakes were made, which were terrible in their consequences, and the evils flowing from which centuries did not suffice to make good. The Scots are not to be driven in matters of worship. They may be led if there is wisdom, if there is, above all, real spiritual power in their leaders. The Scots never had a Liturgy for which they conceived any abiding affection, or which they regarded as a national heritage. John Knox's Liturgy came nearest to this, but no one would now think of recommending it. The Scots always had a great jealousy of being annexed by England, in worship as in other things; and any service book which could be taken as coming from England has a poor chance of acceptance. Last of all, the Scots have always held the theory that a Liturgy is unnecessary if the ministry is what it ought to be; that a true ministry are inspired, and that men who can preach the Word can also exercise the gift of free prayer. The Society will not, I believe, be led to add to the list of failures which have taken place on this field. . . .

"Everything the Society has done has been done openly and above-board. We are taking further steps in the direction of openness by publishing a cheap edition of our services. I would express the hope, then, that the work the Society has done may continue, and may be not less

appreciated than in the past. At the same time I would express the hope that the greater knowledge of the *Euchologion* will not lead to any wooden or slavish use of it. That warning has been uttered at our meetings before now. This Society cannot relieve ministers of the responsibility that rests on them of making their services as good and beautiful as they can. It is for the ministers themselves throughout the Church to consider the use they are to make of the material we have placed before them. They will scarcely find anything better than some of the services in our book. The Communion, the Marriage, the Burial Services are all so good that it would be difficult to surpass them. Of the services for the Sundays of the month, on the other hand, not so much can be said. They are largely drawn from the liturgies of the Reformation, and everyone knows that the liturgies of the Reformation are a great deal more theological than the prayers of the Early Church, or than the prayers of the English Common Order, and not nearly so beautiful. The book, however, provides a great deal of admirable material for varying the services, and it is to be used with discretion. If ministers thus deal with [redacted]nd also draw from other sources which are readil[redacted]e, they will save the book from becoming a yoke and a burden on the congregations, of which otherwise there might be some danger. If I may recur to what I said at our meeting two years ago, in a living Church like ours ministers ought to be producing prayers—not only prayers used on an occasion and never heard again, though these may be best of all, but prayers which can be communicated to others. We ought to help one another in this. Cannot our country ministers give us some prayers for the natural seasons of the year, for the experiences which the seasons of the year bring to the

agricultural community; and cannot our town ministers give us some prayers expressing the social aspirations of our great industrial communities? There is little of either of these kinds in our book, and it would be greatly the better of such additions.

"I have sometimes dreamed that we might come to have prayers which the people of Scotland would feel to be their own, produced by men living among them, men who understand their heart, with perhaps some of the free breath of the hills on them, some movement as of the sea, along with the great things which always belong to our dear religion in whatever land. Dreams are apt not to be very practical, but the door can perhaps be kept open for anything of that kind that may come to us. . . .

"I trust the Society has before it a useful career. The need for guidance in the matter of religious services has not altogether passed away. There is still need to insist on the dignity and sacredness of our rites, and also to see to the preservation in them of what is characteristic of our country and in itself valuable. The administration of the Sacraments has not yet escaped from the old carelessness. Baptism, I have alwa[redacted]t, ought not to take place in private dwellings. [redacted]urch might take up a stronger attitude in that matter, and insist that the lambs of the flock should be received in the place where the flock is present to welcome them. As to the Lord's Supper, I trust the good old Scotch form will not be departed from, that the members sit all together at the table, or what is as nearly like a table as it can be made, with the ministers not far away—not high above—and that they should hand to each other the cup and the bread. The individual cup and the practice of cutting up the bread into small pieces are practices very destructive to the

idea of the rite. Again, I hope that hymns are not to be used so as to displace the Psalms, the oldest and most universal and most expressive of all our hymns. As for new paths which the Society might take, I have little to add to what has been said by others. The Society might perhaps take in hand the preparation of a book of College Prayers. We have daily prayers at St. Andrews, and, I believe, also in Glasgow. A book of daily prayers for these services would be very useful."

In September my Father attended the Congress of the History of Religions at Oxford, where he enjoyed meeting many of the contributors to the *Review of Theology*, whom before he had only known through correspondence. He opened his Class that year with a public Lecture on *The Place of the New Testament in Christianity*.

In the last days of December there was an unusually severe snowstorm. My Father had been in Edinburgh at the customary family gathering, and coming home it was found at Leuchars that the St. Andrews line was blocked. There seemed to be no chance of his getting home that night. But he [redacted] his wife that he would be home, and there was no [redacted]nding her a message. So, while the rest of the St. Andrews passengers went on to Dundee to spend the night there, he got out of the train and walked home through deep snowdrifts. It was a dangerous proceeding, as he was alone and no one knew that he had started. He arrived about midnight, and was rather pleased with the exploit. He was young in spirit to the end of his life, preferring to run upstairs rather than to walk, and always ready to undertake enterprises which most men of his age would not seriously have considered.

At the close of the College session of 1909 he again

visited Rome, and in the summer of the following year he went to Switzerland by his favourite route, up the Rhine. For one week he took a complete holiday. He went to Geneva, where the associations of Calvin were much in his mind, and thence up the Rhone valley to Zermatt and the Gornergrat. He felt deeply the appeal of the grandeur of that scenery, and marvelled at the panorama of snowy mountains and their glaciers as he wandered about the little meadow paths near Zermatt, where the cow-bells tinkled and the herds of goats were driven out to their mountain pastures in the morning. He returned to Thun by Villeneuve, memorable no less for its particularly poisonous mosquitoes than for its view, and he made a brief stay at Fribourg to hear again the famous organ he remembered as a boy.

Having spent a month at Heidelberg, once more revising his *History of Religion* at the University Library, and writing a paper on the *Odes of Solomon*, he returned home to find his own University engaged in preparing for the celebration of its Quincentenary in October 1911. Besides serving on many Committees, my Father, with Professor Steggall of Dundee, had charge of the editing and publishing of the Memorial Volume, *Votiva Tabella*. It was intended as a book of information about St. Andrews University, "to be placed in the hands of the many distinguished guests who came from many lands to take part in the Festival." Along with the late Principal Stewart, my Father contributed the article on *Theological Studies at St. Andrews*. One of the guests at our home, 58 South Street, during the Quincentenary, was Professor Adolf Deissmann, a most delightful and interesting man, who afterwards sent his host two fragments of *Ostraka* as a *freundliche Errinnerung* of his visit.

After the fatigues of the Celebrations, my Father took his family to Innellan, on the Firth of Clyde, to recuperate. From his early youth he had been greatly attracted to the West Coast; he had spent eighteen months on the Firth when he was tutor at Ascog, and during his year at the Havannah in Glasgow he used to refresh himself from his labours amongst indescribable squalor and misery by a sail on the Clyde. It had been one of his dreams to retire some day to the West Coast, and this longing now came back to him with such force that the fortnight at Innellan was spent chiefly in looking at houses. When a house was found with a verandah from which the eye could command the Firth as far up as the Cloch Lighthouse and down past the mountains of Arran to the open sea, there was no longer any question about settling there. The house was bought without delay, and the big home at St. Andrews being disposed of, a smaller dwelling suitable for winter quarters was found, and from that time Innellan was his principal home. There he entertained his friends and his grandchildren. Miles of moorland led away over the hills behind the house, and on the sea in front he kept his small sailing [redacted]. There was an incessant stream of shipping passing down the Firth, not to speak of the destroyers that ran their trial trips and their measured mile along the opposite shore, and the huge battleships that were to be seen from time to time. A powerful telescope was one of the first extravagances of Innellan, and soon the Professor was keeping a strict watch on the exports and imports of the Clyde. He was very happy. The garden was a great pleasure to him and the field beyond, where he planted trees—he always had a great affection for trees, and would walk round the field every morning to see what progress they were making. Above all, there

were few interruptions to his work. He established himself in a large room at the top of the house, away from everyone, and there in a study furnished with all that he required, a big table, a wooden chair and books; devoid of all that most men call comfort, he spent the greater part of every day, industriously happy. Now and then, when working out an idea or seeking for a word that eluded him, he would take a walk down to the gate or a stroll round his garden. And as a rule there was a walk after tea, generally on the hillside, to get a view far out over the "wideness of the sea."

He was a man of simple tastes; outside things were unnecessary to him who had such a goodly store of comfort and strength within. He used often to say that, like the Buddhists, he had no desires, and his only extravagance—if indeed it can be called by such a hard name—was in the buying of books. He was fond of pretty china too, and would often bring back something of this kind to his wife after a day in Edinburgh or Glasgow. On his holidays the only thing he was particular about was that he should have a table in his room big enough to hold some books and convenient for writing at.

"His was indeed a remarkable personality," writes Dr. Ballingal. "Ordinary philistine people would easily take him for a man of no account; so modest was he, so simple in his manner, so considerate of ignorance, that they never divined his deep and varied learning. But those who knew him were always conscious of something that marked him out among other men—higher standards of judgment and of feeling, a wonderful consideration towards weakness and failure, great power to endure and forgive wrong. The moral strength and beauty of his character were indeed remarkable, conjoined as they were with immense loving-

kindness, so that everyone who was brought in contact with him felt that he was like a brother. And all this was illumined by a strong sense of humour. He was the most genial of companions, whether at the fireside or on the golf course, or among his students. By them he was beloved, and they always felt how much he influenced their lives for good, while they also revered him as a wise and competent teacher. His lectures were distinctly enlightening, and his frequent flashes of humour gave piquancy to a subject necessarily rather dry."

In 1912 the Commentary on II. Corinthians appeared. The object of the book is explained in the Preface. "There are various ways," he says, "in which a Commentary on a Pauline Epistle may be written. In the present one the author offers his own translation as evidence that he has faithfully studied the text of the Epistle, its words and its grammar; but he has felt himself attracted mainly to the Apostle's history, and to the thoughts he here wrote down; and he offers this book, the fruit of years of study with a class, as a piece of work on the earliest history of the Church and on the thought of the Apostle of the Gentiles."

My Father was gratified when, in the autumn of this year, he was made President of the Theological Society of the United Free Church College of Edinburgh. He delivered the opening Address of the session, a paper on the *Preparation of the Apostle Paul*, which grew out of many questions he had to study for his Commentary, but which could not be dealt with in that book. "The results of my researches," he says, "are interesting. I make no apology for presenting them to you as the gift I offer in return for the high honour you have done me in making me the President, this year, of your Society."

The study of the life and teaching of St. Paul was one of the great interests of his life. Dr. James Moffatt—who has edited the unfinished MS. of the *Study of Calvin* for this volume—has given us the following account of my Father's own "preparation," in an appreciation of his position as a Theologian and a Churchman.

"When Dr. Menzies was inducted into his parish at Abernyte in 1873," writes Dr. Moffatt, "the prospects of progressive theology in Scotland were not bright. Ecclesiastical pre-occupations were in danger of retarding any advance in the Church of Scotland and in the Free Church. The first advance soon came, but it was in the region of Old Testament Criticism. The Robertson Smith controversy in the Free Church was much more than an ecclesiastical trouble; it shook the Free Church out of an orthodox torpor, but far beyond the borders of that Church it opened the entire question of Biblical Criticism, and forced upon the minds of intelligent Christians an issue which could not be confined to the mere matter of the Pentateuchal problem. As yet, however, the New Testament question was not raised, in Scotland at any rate. There was a disinclination in more than ecclesiastical circles to read the signs of the times. Dr. Hanna's *Our Lord's Life on Earth* had indeed stirred some misgivings in evangelical circles of the Free Church; it seemed to bring out too clearly that human side of Jesus Christ which *Ecce Homo* in 1866 represented for the first time to English readers, and the brand of Strauss was upon all such essays. But Dr. Hanna's pages were mild, so far as critical methods went, and this line of thought was not followed up.

"The vital interest, so far as New Testament criticism in Great Britain was concerned, centred in the new estimate

of St. Paul which the Tübingen school had popularised. Even this could not be acclimatised in our country. Jowett's edition of St. Paul had a breadth and an independence of judgment which were superior to any German work, but it was so unfavourably received by his fellow-churchmen in England, that he had taken refuge in the arrowless field of translating Plato, and the subsequent controversy over *Supernatural Religion* in the seventies turned rather upon the question of miracles and revelation than upon strictly historical criticism. Dr. Samuel Davidson's second edition of his *New Testament Introduction* proved too advanced for most of his contemporaries; a general check set in all along the line, and the result was that public interest was drawn more and more into the Old Testament controversy.

"But a fresh era was dawning. The newer methods were about to be tested in the New Testament. During the sixteen years previous to his appointment at St. Andrews, Dr. Menzies was quietly and unconsciously preparing himself for future work on the Gospels and St. Paul. He began modestly as a translator. Messrs. Williams & No[redacted] London had undertaken the publication of transl[redacted]n continental literature, which were to be of a less conservative nature than had hitherto been introduced to the English public. The Prospectus of the 'Theological Translation Fund Library' was signed by men like Tulloch, Donaldson, Robert Wallace, the Cairds, Lewis Campbell, as well as by Stanley, Jowett and Martineau. Dr. Menzies identified himself with this party. He translated Baur's *Church History of the First Three Centuries*, his *Paul*, as well as Pfleiderer's four volumes on the *Philosophy of Religion*. Baur was important as Pfleiderer never was. But it was the latter's

book which probably moved Dr. Menzies afterwards to write that successful manual on *The History of Religion* for a series edited by his colleague Professor Knight. This appeared in 1895; it won an instant hearing, and it has gone through several editions. It represents a broad-minded attitude towards comparative religion which has been of real service to the subject. Width of culture and moderation of judgment are essential to any survey of such a field, and these were conspicuous in Dr. Menzies' pages, but the ability of the handbook was not less remarkable than its open-mindedness.

"Yet this represented only one interest of his mind. To discuss frankly religions and religion did not hinder him from studying his own religion. It was the New Testament which engaged his thoughts, and when he was appointed to succeed Professor Crombie in the Chair of Biblical Criticism at St. Andrews University, he got his chance of contributing to that subject as well as of teaching it.

"His edition of *The Earliest Gospel* in 1901 marked a real step forward in New Testament Criticism in this country. No commentary on St [redacted] Gospel in our language had faced the modern [redacted] with such frankness and lucidity. In fact, even yet, Lagrange's French edition is its only rival in any language, and Lagrange writes from a Roman Catholic point of view, for all his scholarship and liberalism. Dr. Menzies subordinates the philosophical to the historical side of his task. The gospel as a product of the apostolic age is before his mind, no less than as a record of Jesus. But, as he says in his Preface, his commentary 'is written with a profound conviction that as criticism declares the second Gospel to be the porch by which we must go in to find

the Saviour as he was and is, the earnest reader of the Gospel may indeed find him there.' I quote this deliberately. The Iphigenia of Euripides says caustically that the only fine thing about the cult of Artemis in Tauris is its name, and many people have been inclined to say the same about the Broad Church movement. Unjustly—at anyrate so far as men like Dr. Menzies are concerned. Others may have given the impression that the chief joy of the Broad Churchman was to minimise Christian dogma and devotion. But the best of them, in Scotland as well as in England, had nobler aims, and if Dr. Menzies set aside views which some of his fellow-Christians deemed vital, it was with the sincere desire and conviction that the reality of Jesus Christ should be intelligible to this generation.

"The result has been that while the average commentary has a short life, *The Earliest Gospel* is still a ripe, educative book; it gives an adequate idea of modern methods and aims in the criticism of the Gospels, and it concentrates the reader's attention upon the central figure in the story. As for his suggestive edition of the *Second Epistle to the C[illegible]ians*, which did not appear till 1912, we may say that [illegible]n up on the same plan. Here the author's independent judgment is particularly noticeable just as in the posthumous article on Paul which appears in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. He writes out of a full acquaintance with the best work on the Epistle, and yet goes on his own way, with touches of insight and appreciation which remind one of Jowett at his best. What he gives in the shape of interpretation is what one can hardly get elsewhere.

"Thus, on both of the great figures in the dawn of Christianity, Jesus and Paul, Dr. Menzies was able to say

something, and what he said was a liberating word. In both cases there was detachment for the sake of a larger outlook. But his work for theology was far wider than those special contributions. It is significant to read over again the two sermons which, like Principal Caird, Dr. Cunningham of Crieff, Dr. Story of Rosneath, and Professor Knight, he contributed in 1880 to *Scotch Sermons*. In one of these he pleads that Christianity is broader than any creed, and wider than any Church, and that all beneficence and care for the health and welfare of men is as truly Christian as interest in doctrines. In the other he dwells on 'the work of those whose hope for the future lies not in alterations of ecclesiastical organisation, but in a profounder apprehension of the essential ideas of Christianity, and especially in the growth, within the Church, of such a method of presenting them as shall show that they are equally adapted to the needs of humanity and in harmony with the results of critical and scientific research.'

"These words are the keynote to Dr. Menzies' ideas and aims in theology. He came to his position as a responsible teacher in the Church of Scotland when the current in theology was flowing in the channels of philosophical religion cut by Professor Flint's powerful genius. With this interest, which stood for so much in Scotland, side by side with the influence of the Cairds in Glasgow, Dr. Menzies had much in common. But it fell to him to cut another channel, that is, in the criticism of the New Testament. The historical aspect of Christianity drew him more powerfully than the philosophical. What his contemporaries in the Free Church, Professor Bruce and Professor Dods, were doing, he did from a different angle, although he never had to face controversy

in Church courts; he reached circles which his two contemporaries could not reach so easily, and he had resources of technical scholarship which were his own.

"Under him the Board Church movement contributed to progress, side by side with the evangelical. Besides that, he was able, as editor of the *Review of Theology and Philosophy* from 1905 to 1915, to exercise a real influence upon current theological thought. A magazine of this kind gave him opportunities, direct and indirect, which suited his qualities. His own contributions, mainly on New Testament topics, were a feature of the *Review*. But he used it to stir and sustain interest in progressive theology. His reputation enabled him to get many to write for him, not only those who had reputations of their own, but some younger men all over the country, who were encouraged by his help to give themselves to serious study in all departments of theology. *Erat non studiorum tantum verum etiam studiosorum amantissimus*, said Pliny about one of his friends. Dr. Menzies also interested himself in his fellow-workers as well as in studies. His quiet persistence kept them moving. In this way, although it is not [illegible] which can be set down on paper as definitely as [illegible]ks, he contributed to the progress of a wider theology and to a more generous attitude towards Biblical criticism in our tongue and country far beyond his class-room. What ought to make us specially grateful for this contribution is the recollection that he stood with unobtrusive, unflinching courage for the cause of theological freedom long before it became so popular as it is to-day in the region of New Testament Criticism. If his younger contemporaries learned and loved to look up to him, it was because he had looked ahead from the first, before even he had gained his position in the Uni-

versity and in the Church, and because the responsibilities of academic authority never dimmed his intellectual vision. Any man who makes this impression on others is sure to be an influence, not merely by what he writes, but by what he is. Professor Menzies, in the ways I have indicated and in others, was an educating force in his day, and, although the history of the day before yesterday is generally obscure, it only requires a glance at the change in our biblical theology during the past thirty years to appreciate the service rendered by scholars of this sound, progressive type, to the cause of honest religious freedom."

The last Italian journey was in the spring of 1913. The winter had been particularly cold and dreary, and so the journey south was made without a stop. At Lugano warm sunshine and almond blossom greeted the travellers, whose spirits rose accordingly. Several delightful days were spent there, sailing on the lake and visiting many a beautiful little country church. On the way to Venice we stayed at Verona, where my Father would willingly have remained for weeks. At Venice it was cold that spring; gondolas were not an unmixed delight on the narrow sunless waterways, and much of the sightseeing was done on foot. By the end of the first week the Professor was able to guide his party anywhere they wanted to go, and as we walked, many out of the way corners and shrines were chanced upon which the ordinary traveller seldom discovers.

The day at Torcello was one of the most delightful. A warm sun lit up the lagoons, and the little island churches seen in the distance seemed to rise like dream cities out of the pale waters. Torcello itself was bathed in sunlight, and the voyage home, with the wonderful colours of the

sails seen against a sunset sky, ended a day of days. On approaching Venice, an Austrian airship was seen high above; it circled over the city, and then made off in the direction of the Austrian frontier. But in 1913 that sight conveyed no menace, nor was the fleet of Italian torpedo boats and destroyers just below the windows of the hotel—a German house by the way—regarded as ever likely to be used in war against the Central Empires.

After Venice, the Professor fulfilled a long-cherished desire in visiting Padua and Ravenna. In both, Italian *Alberghi* were frequented, and both cities seemed to transport the traveller back many centuries. In Ravenna particularly time seemed to lose its hold, and the centuries since the life of Christ upon the earth dropped out of existence. My Father was fascinated by Ravenna, and determined to go back there. Siena too—where rooms were found in an old Italian house and meals were served on a balcony festooned by wisteria and looking across the valley up to the soaring tower of the Duomo—Siena was to be revisited. The journey was continued to Assisi, stopping on the way at Chiusi, the Clusium of Lars Porsena.

My Father entered fully into the charm of Assisi, a town full of the fragrance of St. Francis, where the influence of the "little poor man" still lives, and where his presence can be felt. On the Sunday morning we rose early and walked up to the *Carceri*, the little mountain fastness where St. Francis went to escape from the world. The only other worshippers were two peasants and a brown-robed and emaciated friar who served the Mass. Afterwards came the walk down the mountain-side to Assisi again, the sun falling gently on the waters of the Tiber as it flowed slowly on its winding course across the great plain.

Before leaving Italy there was a short stay at Genoa, where the sea and the shipping at once began to claim my Father's attention. We had a row round the great harbour to see a new Italian Dreadnought which had just been launched.

In the autumn of that year there was a Conference of the *Society for Biblical Study* in Glasgow. My Father had a good deal to do with the arrangements for it, and read a paper on the *Sources of the Acts*, which afterwards appeared in the *Interpreter*. He also wrote a paper on *Law in the New Testament* for Dr. Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (Vol. vii., pp. 823-827). And he began to think of his next important piece of work —a book he had been asked to write on *Calvin and Calvinism* for a Series on the Reformers—he opened his Class that winter with a public Lecture on *Calvin as an Interpreter of Scripture*. The two following summers were occupied with this piece of work, and he was just about to complete it in 1916, when he was called away.

The spring of 1914 marked t[illegible]mpletion of his twenty-fifth year of teaching, [illegible]past and present students had arranged to give [illegible]ner, at which they were to present an Address. This function was destined not to take place, for his brother Robert, the companion of many happy days, died two days earlier. The Address was presented privately, and the Professor had a copy of it and of his reply printed and sent to each of his students. So deeply was he gratified by this event, that I venture to append the Address, as well as his reply.

TO THE REVEREND

ALLAN MENZIES, M.A., B.D., D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS.

We, your students past and present, unite in congratulating you on the completion of twenty-five years as Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of St. Andrews.

We consider that your appointment to the position you now occupy was singularly wise and fortunate. Already by your published works you had earned a name as a student and independent worker in the field of Biblical studies, and during your occupancy of the Chair you have enhanced your reputation and added lustre to the ancient College of St. Mary's.

For ourselves, we regard it as an inestimable privilege to have had as students the benefit and stimulus of your teaching and example. In the Class we felt that we were listening to a master of the subject, and your faculty of clear and interesting exposition added pleasure to the profit we derived from your teaching.

But while we acknowledge that we owe much to your instruction, we feel that we owe not less, but even more, to the inspiration of your example. Yourself a patient and indefatigable student, you showed us how to study. Yourself a learner as well as a teacher, you taught us how to learn. By your transparent simplicity of aim, your unflagging industry, your devotion to the truth, your impartiality, your unfettered yet reverent handling of the New Testament Scripture, you showed us the true function of criticism—not to destroy but to build up, not to

search for arguments in support of judgments previously formed, but by patient study to arrive at the truth, or at least follow where it leads.

Your relations with us have always been of the happiest description. No Professor could have endeared himself to his students in greater degree than you have done, and no students could have cherished towards their Professor feelings of greater confidence and attachment than we. For your unfailing kindness and interest in them, your students, wherever they are, will always thank you.

We beg your acceptance of this Address with the assurance of our most sincere gratitude and veneration and affection.

We desire in these congratulations to include Mrs. Menzies, of whose constant kindness we have the most grateful recollection.

That you may continue for many years to occupy the position you adorn and to contribute to the advancement of those studies to which you have devoted your life is the sincere prayer of all your students.

Signed in their behalf,

WILLIAM EDIE. ROBERT JOHNSTONE.
GEORGE CHRISTIE. [illegible] DALL.
GORDON MOORE.

LETTER OF THANKS BY PROFESSOR MENZIES TO MY STUDENTS, 1889-1914.

GENTLEMEN,

You kindly invited me to be your guest at the dinner of old St. Andrews students which takes place annually in Edinburgh at the time of the Assembly; and

to receive an Address from you on the occasion of my completing twenty-five years of teaching as Professor of Biblical Criticism in St. Mary's College. The prospect pleased me much; I was to see my students of every year, and to have an opportunity of speaking to you all at once. But a family bereavement prevented me from fulfilling the engagement; and the Address you had prepared, both in its words and in its execution a work to be admired, was presented to me at a private meeting on the closing day of the Assembly, the 29th of May. It was inevitable that few should be present at that meeting. But I wish my thanks to reach you all, and I therefore print them, and send them to you with my sincerest compliments and good wishes to each of you.

It may interest you to know that the presentation took place in room No. 1 under the Assembly Hall, that Mr. Christie presided, and that Mr. Edie made the presentation. His words in doing so were full of sincerity and good feeling and taste, and while I could not accept them altogether, they enhanced to me materially the value of your gift. It is a matter of great pride and satisfaction to me that you have said me this handsome compliment while I am still [redacted] you have enabled me to know that you think I have been of some use to you, and that I am supported by the goodwill of those to whom my life has been devoted. In what Mr. Edie said of the hard work I did for you and of the midnight oil I burned, he went, I fear, somewhat beyond the facts. I burned that oil but seldom, doing my work coolly, at regular hours, and with pauses for consideration. For my students I thought my duty lay in proving an efficient signpost to them, to the direction where light was to be found on our subject, and also a taskmaster who by the problems he

set caused them to find out their own powers of arriving at what the New Testament contained, thus encouraging them to work in the great field.

Of one great hindrance I may speak which I found in the earlier part of my teaching, namely, the want of English books which could be recommended as setting before the student the true position of our subject. I found men in my class who evidently had access to old books, found no doubt in the library of a father or an uncle, and having little relation to modern methods of study. It is true still that one cannot go far in theology with the English language only; it was much more true at that time, when the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* alone, with the articles of the late Professor W. R. Smith and others, filled the place now taken by the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* and Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*; when there were few good commentaries on books of the New Testament, and the best that existed, those of Lightfoot and Westcott, were so wanting in historical insight; when Sir J. Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae* had not been writ[illegible] and the Synoptic Gospels could only be studied righ[illegible]s is indeed still to a large degree the case, with [illegible] of German. A Scottish Professor of the New T[illegible] occupied in those days a position of great freedom; his students had to take his word for what he said, much more than is now the case; he quoted authorities to them, but he knew that the books he named to them were beyond their reach.

And this leads me further to remark that if, as your beautiful Address assures me, you have found my teaching useful, it is due to the fact that the period during which I have held my chair has been a period of marked and extraordinary advance in the study of the New Testament.

Lectures could not fail to be interesting which reflected in any degree the growing light which has shone during this period on the Gospels and the Epistles. The work done on the Gospels during the last quarter of a century has determined much more certainly than ever before the order and the relation to each other of these wonderful books; it has brought us a much more definite apprehension of the task which Jesus took up, of his methods in discharging it, and of his human nature and character. We can understand as never before the actions he performed, we can hear better the tones of his voice. Similarly the work of recent times, done by philologists and students of religion on the condition of the Western world under the Empire, has made Paul much more intelligible to us and enabled us to appreciate in a new way the work he took in hand of planting the Gospel in Greek soil. We understand better than we did the hindrances and dangers which beset him from Jew and Gentile, and we appreciate better the nature of the Gospel he preached.

In reading the New Testament I have been mainly intent on grasping the historical reality the books contain. I have treated them as containing a record of things which really took place and words for the most part really spoken by the persons to whom they are attributed. I have criticised them in order to distinguish the original facts from the later accretions and doubtful doctrines which inevitably gathered around them; and I have striven to get the books to speak to us with their own voice, so that we might hear and understand their real meaning. This aim has been to me the central and dominant one; not that I do not recognise other aims which ought to be present to the mind of the teacher of the New Testament, but because that one seems to me to be far the most important. A

University teacher is bound to be cautious and exact and to keep his eye open to every part of his field of study; and I have tried to place before you as far as one man could the methods and the progress of textual criticism, the new studies of the language and grammar of the Greek Testament, and other ancillary disciplines, but it has been my chief desire to realise the meaning of the books read in the class, to make out what they say to us. I have tried to make the New Testament a living book to my students, a book occupied with things which really happened and which it is possible for us in some measure to understand. I acknowledge with hearty gratitude the interest with which you always followed my teaching, and of which your Address speaks, and I am encouraged to think that notwithstanding the manifold drawbacks and imperfections of my work, of which I am well aware, my aim has been, at least to some extent, attained.

A Professor must recognise it as his first duty to bring his students up to the present level of the study entrusted to him; and in a field like Biblical C[illegible]icism this may well occupy the whole time of the cla[illegible] the books he writes, however, and presents to [illegible]urch and to the public he may properly state the [illegible]e personally holds. In my books all my teaching, such as it is, lies before you.

When I look over the lists of my class during the last twenty-five years I feel proud of the historic positions filled by some of my former students, of the books some of them have written, of the chairs some of them occupy, not to speak of many of them filling less conspicuous positions in the Church who discharge with admirable faithfulness and zeal the duties of the ministry in town and country, and are happy in doing so. My former students are to be found in many Churches, in many lands. It is

a great encouragement to me for the years which may still lie before me as a teacher to know that I have the approval of such a body of men.

I thank you from my heart for the kindness you have shown to me in presenting me with your Address. Mrs. Menzies also desires to thank you for your mention of her in it. We shall still watch with the utmost interest the development of your careers; and you will always find a welcome in our house, here or at St. Andrews.

INNELLAN, *June* 1914.

During his twenty-seven years at St. Mary's College, my Father twice saw the teaching staff completly changed. Principal Cunningham was succeeded in 1894 by the Rev. Alexander Stewart who had been for some years minister of the parish of Mains, near Dundee, when my Father was at Abernyte; they were in the same Presbytery, and they translated together Pfleiderer's *Philosophy of Religion*. At St. Andrews they worked together harmoniously for more than twenty years; and it was to deliver the Funeral Sermon [redacted] his old friend that my Father appeared, almost for the last time, in the pulpit of the College Church. Principal Stewart was succeeded in 1915 by Principal Galloway, and my father felt great pride and satisfaction that so distinguished a scholar should rule over the destinies of St. Mary's College.

Professor Mitchell was succeeded in the Chair of Church History by Professor—now Sir John—Herkless, who became in 1915 Principal of the University, and who has written the following appreciation of my Father's work at St. Andrews.

"Accurate scholarship, wide learning, fidelity in research, critical judgment, and a desire to teach were the

qualifications of Dr. Menzies for a Professor's chair," writes the Principal; "fortunately for himself and the University, he received an appointment in St. Andrews. He secured a quiet place in the world, and the University obtained a scholar. For a generation he occupied the Chair of Biblical Criticism, and from the first to the last year of his incumbency he was pre-eminently successful as a teacher. The students were aware of his high reputation as a scholar, and respected that reputation. They found in his Class-room that he was learned in his subject and competent to teach it. Keenly alive to the fascination of that subject for scholars and to its value for religious men, he infected his students with his own love for New Testament study; and having knowledge to impart and the art to give it, he was a genuine preceptor. He was always ready for the day's work, and no slovenly habit was encouraged by his example. In his speech, as in his writing, there were the excellent qualities of lucidity and epigrammatic terseness; and in his lectures, as in his ordinary talk, there were constant flashes of humour.

"Through and through the man hi[illegible] was true, and sincerity became the tradition of [illegible]ass-room. On occasion words were spoken, perh[illegible] the direct intent of the speaker, which awakened [illegible] pupils from their dogmatic slumbers; but never was a syllable uttered which was an assault on religious feeling. Professor Menzies was religious, pious and devout, and the students beheld his spiritual character. Reverently, and always reverently, he handled the New Testament, with which he specially dealt, but his reverence was not extended to prejudice, superstition and ignorance. He was a fearless critic, seeking to get at the truth. In no degree was he a dogmatist.

"The truth as it was for him was set forth in its reasonableness; and its reasonableness was its guarantee. The influence of a dexterous and fearless critic over an eager student may be fraught with danger, and mischief may be done in the sphere of religion; but, when to skill and daring, reverence and grace are added, good may prosper. Good did prosper in the St. Andrews Class-room. If traditionalism was assailed, ignorance was destroyed; and if doubt was fostered, authority with no reason for its foundation, was cast down.

"In the ordinary business of the University Professor Menzies took his part, and he was ever interested in its advancement. He intervened in the debates of the Senate only when he had something to say, and his colleagues heard him gladly. They, like his students, were aware of his high reputation as a scholar, and they honoured and admired the wise, simple-minded, gentle and quiet man who was associated with them. The service in the University Chapel, from time to time, was conducted by him. He had a Gospel to preach, and he preached it. God in Christ and Christ in [illegible]were his themes, and the love of God and the Grace [illegible] Lord Jesus Christ were the fundamental articles [illegible]gion. These things he preached as one having au[illegible].

"For ten years Professor Menzies was Editor of the *Review of Theology and Philosophy*. Many articles and reviews were written by well-known scholars, and some by younger men, to whom he gave opportunity to exercise their critical power. The *Review* was devoted to free and scholarly criticism; and while it instructed readers, it gave young writers a chance for which they were grateful to the Editor. Articles were signed, and seldom did the Editor interfere with the judgment of the authors.

"Professor Menzies, as certain of his writings showed, might have filled the Chair of Systematic Theology or of Church History; but his books on *The Earliest Gospel* and the *Second Epistle to the Corinthians* indicated that he was preeminently fitted for the work of the Chair to which he had been called. In these books, as in the Class Lectures, his scholarship and learning were seen, and in all his labours there was manifested the grace of reverence for revealers of the sacred ideas of religion. Dealing with the New Testament, he knew the history of the Canon, and knew therefore how the Canon was framed. The Church of which he was a member had no theory of inspiration; and loyal to that Church as he was, he was free to exercise his critical judgment when engaged with the problems of the New Testament. His treatment of the Synoptic problem, which may be seen in the introduction to *The Earliest Gospel*, illustrates his constructive criticism, and illustrates too, his freedom from traditional opinion.

"His power was not exhausted in destroying, but was used for high purposes of instruction. At one period of his career, when there was a murmuri[illegible] the Hebrews against the Grecians, there was a ru[illegible] persecution, and Professor Menzies was to be [illegible], but action did not follow talk, and with him the[illegible]s no shadow of turning. He was never afraid of suffering, and was willing, should there be need, to witness for truth. Yet he knew that tradition was powerless against science, opinion against scholarship; and he continued to use the methods of science, working ever and only as a scholar.

"Brave and fearless he was, but never blatant in speech or aggressive in manner; and he offended no one, though his scholarship itself was an offence to those who trembled for tradition. If he was a suspect in the eyes of the

ignorant, he was a scholar by the judgment of the learned; and great indeed was his service for the cause of New Testament criticism. The diligent and skilful workman was honoured by the craftsmen of his guild.

"Suddenly, when the shadows of evening had not yet fallen, his day was closed. He passed, but his work remains. He has been the teacher of men who will teach other men. Books he has written have places in the literature of New Testament criticism. The reputation of St. Andrews University is higher by his sojourn in it."

Sir John Herkless was succeeded in Church History by Professor Main, who had already written much for the *Review of Theology*, and was in no wise a stranger. He has added to many kindnesses shown to my Father by editing a part of this volume.

The Chair of Hebrew was filled on the death of Professor Birrell by the Rev. D. M. Kay (now D.S.O.), who came from Constantinople to instruct the budding divines at St. Andrews. He is now "somewhere" in Macedonia, or we should h[illegible]had a few words from him about the colleague wh[illegible]egarded as one of his best friends at St. Andrews. [illegible]Kay was one of the moving spirits in instituting [illegible]Prayers at St. Andrews, and in that connection he and my Father had much to do with each other.

When war broke out in 1914 it is easy to imagine what distress of mind it caused my Father, though he never spoke much about it. He had been brought up in Germany; some of his happiest days had been spent there; much of his work was done in that country, and he owed much to the previous researches of German scholars, among whom he had many personal friends and correspondents.

One of his own books had been translated into German, and was well known and much used there. It is easy then to understand his sorrow when he saw Germany throw aside all that stood for Christianity and morality, adopting the manners and ideas of barbarism. But he had no feelings of revenge, rather of pity and of hope that that great nation might be led to see the error of its ways. In the last sermon he preached in the College Chapel, he said in concluding, "It might be given even to a nation that has sorely mistaken the true view and the right spirit of human life, to repent of its error and to take its place as a friend and not an enemy of the surrounding nations, heartily striving to help them forward to good things. May God grant that this awakening, this generous change may come in time to the nation with which we are at war. May He grant to us at least, by cheerfulness and kindliness, to turn our back upon the shadow of the past, and, along with those we strive to strengthen, to direct our faces to the good time that is coming."

Early in 1915, after a severe cold, my Father was quite deaf for more than three months. He had a set of small tablets made, and with their aid and the deaf and dumb alphabet, a lively conversation was kept up. Though he felt the trial very keenly, he tried not to let others see his depression. We find in his Journal, "Very depressed this week. Must not give way to such feelings."

The next session—the last—was, from a variety of causes which need not be gone into here, a very hard one for my Father. That winter he never had time to do more than prepare for his class; the paper on *Acts*, which he had written for Professor Peake's new Bible Commentary, was practically finished, but had to be revised after classes began. Then he had undertaken to write an article

on *Paul* for Dr. Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. He worked at this on Saturdays and in any spare moment he could find. When the classes closed and the family went to Pitlochry for a fortnight, it was nearly half written. It engrossed his attention to the exclusion of everything else; for, as he said, the more he worked at the history of St. Paul, the more he was fascinated by the grandeur of his character, the power and effectiveness of his life. Paul was always one of his heroes. My Father took fairly long walks at Pitlochry, and he enjoyed the bracing air. But he complained to his daughter after a few days that he felt no better of the change; and on one of his walks, having his unfinished book on Calvin hanging heavy on his mind, he said to her that he wished he could have just a few days with no bit of work pressing to be done. And this was not like him, who before had always looked forward eagerly to his next enterprise. But the time spent at Pitlochry was very happy: the weather was perfect, and the wide views and absence of College responsibilities, after a peculiarly trying session, combined to cheer our little household.

On the 27th we moved to Innellan for the summer. My Father was delighted as ever to return to his home; the place seemed always more charming after the long winter; the view was not surpassed by any in Scotland, he would say. He sat down to his books without delay, for his article on *Paul* was promised by May 10. The next week his wife was ill, and there was some anxiety on that account. He helped as usual to carry up her small meals, and they were busy making plans together for the next foreign journey and for the long-promised winter in Rome after he retired, when the war should be over and the University once more fully staffed.

On Saturday, May 6th, he worked all day at his *Paul*. It was a wet, blustering day, and he only went down to the gate to look at the waves. After dinner he came and played with his dog, a Dandie Dinmont of affectionate ways, who looked forward to the usual programme from his master every night, that his paws should be tickled and his tail gently pulled. Good-night was said as usual, and about eleven o'clock my Father went up to rest. Shortly afterwards he became breathless, and in a few seconds he was gone—awakening on the Sabbath morning to the fuller life.

Simple in his life, he was simple in his death too. For him there was no illness, no failing health, no sadness of farewell.

At the morning service in Innellan Church that day Mr. Jenkinson dispensed with the usual sermon, and said only a few words. "An hour ago," he said, "I was in my study preparing for this service. There came a ring of the door-bell, and I learned that Dr. Menzies was dead—called from us quite suddenly last mid[illegible]

"With the shock of that news [illegible] my words must be very few. For I had learned [illegible]Dr. Menzies as I have loved few men. He was a [illegible]nd beautiful soul; simple, childlike, Christlike in character; yet so wise and learned and thoughtful, that one comes across few like him anywhere. He was so modest and unassuming that only one here and there understood his real worth; it was in the circle of home and among very intimate friends that his real greatness was known. And now he has been called away into that world of which we know so little, but in which all our hopes and so many of our hallowed treasures are gathered. . . .

"I had hoped and he had hoped tc spend many years together here, years of fruitful labours for him, in which the garnered treasures of a life of laborious study would be given to the world: years of peace and rest after long toil. But it was not to be.

"We can only thank God for His gift of Allan Menzies to the world, and resign ourselves to the loss now that the gracious gift has been withdrawn."

The last journey was made by motor, right across Scotland by the lochs and passes, from his own garden at Innellan to the College Chapel at St. Andrews. The morning he left Innellan was clear and blue, and as the motor passed slowly out of sight, away towards the hills of Loch Lomond, one could not but feel that all was well.

The next day there was a simple service in the Chapel, and then the procession moved along the North Street he had trod so often as student and Professor, to the last resting-place in the shadow of the Cathedral towers. The undergraduates led the way, and it was an impressive sight to see the long line of red-gowned figures winding through the Cathedral grounds, and out into the New Cemetery, where, overlooking the sea he loved so well, all that was mortal was laid to rest in the little grave, lined with arabis and forget-me-not from his own garden at Innellan.

At the last a choir of students sang softly, with no accompaniment save the murmur of the sea, the hymn beginning,

When the day of toil is done,
  When the race of life is run,
Father, grant thy wearied one,
  Rest for evermore.

"Around the grave stood a large company of men of learning: the notes of the hymn fell soothingly on the ear: the old towers looked down on the scene like great silent mourners, and away to the East was the infinite sea, bathed in bright sunshine."

A Memorial Service was held in the College Chapel the following Sunday, when his old friend, Dr. Ballingal, preached the sermon. Some of it has been already quoted in these pages, but a few sentences may be added here.

"When I speak of these Saints of God who so meekly received the choicest gifts of Heaven and spent them so freely on the world, your thoughts and mine are of him for whom to-day this Memorial Service is being held—Professor Allan Menzies. It is a sore thing to miss in your College precincts, in your streets, on your golf-course, his genial presence, his simple, kindly greeting. When a few days ago we followed his body with reverence to that beautiful graveyard looking out upon the sea he loved so much, our hearts were heavy with the awful suddenness of our loss, and we could only feel the sorrow. But it pleased God to call him away. We must bow to his will, without murmuring—thankful rather that, without any long suffering, he passed away so peacefully.

"Those who knew him will, I think, feel that every day that passes deepens their sense of the worth and beauty of his life and their thankfulness to God for the gift of such a life, as well as their pride and happiness in having known him.

"Here within these ancient walls so much associated with him, permit me to say a few words about some aspects of his life and character. With all his modesty and homeliness, he was a great man. Though he never consciously sought fame, or loved it, his

reputation steadily grew, and his name became well known. By wide circles, both in Europe and America, he was recognised as a distinguished scholar whose learning embraced very extensive fields. In New Testament study especially and in the study of the history of religions he took a foremost place. Of indefatigable industry, he was almost constantly giving out to the world in some form or other the fruit of his studies. His published books and writings reveal him as a most independent thinker, truth-loving, wise and just in criticism, and always deeply reverent. So also his style reveals him—a style perfectly simple, yet effective and clear, like that of the best French writers, and the absolute antithesis of the style of a German theologian. . . .

"There are many old students of his—now parish ministers—who might truly be called his disciples; for they rejoice to acknowledge how much they owe to his instruction and encouragement. And many others in a less close relation to him felt that he was the wisest, the most reliable of counsellors when advice was needed. All his friends knew that. There was a strength in him on which others could lean—the strength of the man of faith. There was also a tenderness and loving-kindness which led men to open their hearts to him.

"The Church of Scotland may well be proud of him and mourn his loss, for in his quiet life, without noise or push, he has done her very great service. Never had the Church a son more loyal. He stood up always for the conservation of the Church's grand inheritance—all that was best in her he strove to maintain; but he aimed at winning both for ministers and people a freer atmosphere, wider scope in many directions. His relation to the Church's Confession of Faith, for example, was not hostile,

but he desired a better and more liberal interpretation and more freedom, and that he lived to see won.

"His own deep spirit of devotion led him to be strongly interested in the improvement of the devotional services of the Church, and he did much in this direction to promote order, reverence and beauty in Church Services. Every movement, in fact, that was for the good of the Church found in him warm sympathy.

"His was truly a full life—a life that has left its mark on the souls of other men, that has helped them onward both on their earthly path and their heavenward—a life full of blessing."

Of letters received from his old students and from other friends since his death, one characteristic may be noted. All the writers—and even those with whom he was not specially intimate—express the same feeling, that they loved him. One old student says, "I never knew anyone who in equal measure drew forth the love of others as he did. In common with everyone who came in contact with the Professor, more especially his students, I had a deep admiration, respect and affection for him. We who had the privilege of studying under him will never cease to be influenced by his devotion to his work as a Professor and his kindliness as a man. More than once I have been deeply touched by his close personal interest—generally shown inadvertently—in the careers of past members of his class."

A few other extracts from such letters may be given.

An old friend writes, "I cannot tell you how highly and sincerely I have always admired and honoured him, and how great a blank it makes in one's outlook now that he has gone. His death appears to me the greatest loss which

the Church of Scotland and the University of St. Andrews have sustained for many a long day, but I rejoice that he has left such an abiding influence for good upon the hearts and minds of so many men.

"His has indeed been a noble life, consecrated to the highest and the best, unswerving in its loyalty to truth, and full of the richest and purest charity. Those of us who have known and honoured him can only try at a far distance to be worthy of so uplifting and inspiring a friendship, and we shall not fail to cherish his memory as one of the best things that life has given us."

An old student writes, "Wherever St. Mary's men foregathered, the talk ever turned on Professor Menzies. He was our idol, endeared to us as no other teacher ever was or could be. 'Of the dead nothing but good'—Professor Menzies when amongst us received no other tribute."

And a last quotation from a "dug-out" somewhere in Macedonia, "I think many students took to liking him first, and then later, becoming aware of the greatness of his mind and nature, mingled awe and reverence with the affection, which became deeper in consequence. Perhaps that was the road the Professor himself walked in acquiring his devotion to Christ."

The following lines were written by the Rev. A. W. Fergusson, of Dundee, a few days after my Father's death.

"The 'Broad' Church does not naturally make for Saintliness. And that for reasons not difficult to understand. It is different with the 'High' and the 'Low.' For the former, by the sheer pressure and intensity of its devotion, of its concentration upon the Sacramental, produces the precious jewel of Christian character out of the common carbon of human nature,—just as the diamond

is said to be made out of carbon by infinite compression. Its very narrowness is all in the way of assisting,—as one gets the impression from such lives as those of Bishop How, or Bishop Paget, or Bishop King.

"The 'Low' Church too, at its best and highest, makes straight for sainthood. In the white heat of a passionate personal devotion to the Risen Lord, all the dross of earth is burned up and destroyed; there remains only the purest gold of human character. As in the life of a man like Dr. M'Murtrie, whose name would certainly be on the calendar of the Church of Scotland Saints, if that Church had such a calendar.

"But the 'Broad' Church has neither the tremendous pressure of a somewhat narrow conviction nor the white heat of a personal devotion to a Saviour who has delivered from Sin and Death. So that it requires an extraordinarily happy mixture of the elements of human character in the seed, and an extraordinarily fortunate culture and development of the plant, before it can attain to the perfect flower of saintliness.

"And yet the 'Broad' Church has never lacked its saints, though it has not abounded in them. One thinks of the Alexandrine Fathers in the third century—Clement, and Origen, and the rest. (It was Origen that Robert Burns quoted, without knowing anything about it, when he bade his Fareweel to 'Nickie Ben,' and was 'wae to think upon yon den even for his sake.') One remembers the Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth century—some of the most beautiful souls in the history of our English race. And in the nineteenth century one recalls with the most ardent affection such men as Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, John Macleod Campbell of Row, and Frederic Denison Maurice—saints every one of

them, these three, if saints there ever were. Saints by the happy fortune of a lucky star—by a certain perfection of poise from the very beginning—by a gracious benignancy of outlook—by a wholesome sweetness of the blood. The *mens naturaliter Christiana*, one might say, raised to its highest power, come to its full fruition.

"And in that small and select succession, even on the morrow of his death, one feels it to be fitting to set the name of Allan Menzies. As a matter of historical fact, the very word was used to the writer by one of Professor Menzies's own colleagues some years ago, used with conviction and great emphasis,—'he's just a saint.'

"He was the bright particular star of his Divinity Hall, the man with a European reputation, whose books had been translated into other languages and won the respect of the foremost authorities in the world. . . .

"But it was not of the scholar one thought as he was laid to rest last Thursday beneath the Tower of St. Regulus and within the hearing of the wave, while the students of the scarlet gown sang softly that 'the day of toil was done.' It was of the friend dearly loved and longed for; the friend whose presence made the day glad in the little village of Innellan, where he spent his summers of late years; the friend who bore the vessels of the Lord so reverently in that little sanctuary. . . ."[1]

One word more remains to be said.

My Father used to say to my Mother, "If I have to go first, I will wait for you at the little wicket-gate."

He had not long to wait. On October 2—barely five months after his death—she followed him.

[1] On the Sunday before his death, Dr. Menzies assisted as an Elder in the celebration of the Holy Sacrament in the Parish Church of Innellan.

She lived a retiring life, but much of his power for work and his calm strength came from the perfect happiness and companionship of his home. One of his sisters wrote to my Mother after his death, "Whenever I think of you, I bless you for all you were to Allan, giving him courage and confidence to achieve what he most desired."

And her help was not entirely the help of companionship. She had a fine sense of good English, and an independent, wide outlook. He never preached or printed anything till she had read it, and she would make pages of careful corrections and suggestions, which he considered and generally carried out. When he was at Bonn working at his *History of Religion*, each chapter, as it was finished ready for the printer, was sent home to her. A bundle of her letters to him about the book were found carefully put away among his papers.

Theirs was one life, in which everything was shared. Happy for them that at the end they were separated only by these few short weeks.

PART II

A STUDY OF CALVIN AND CALVINISM

NOTE

SHORTLY before his death, Dr. Menzies had agreed to contribute to a current series a volume upon Calvin and his theology. He did not live to finish this textbook; but the notes which he had prepared seemed on the whole to be full enough to justify their publication, and they are now offered as a partial draft of what the author intended to complete.

It is only fair to emphasise these words, "a partial draft." The notes which we have been able to decipher from Dr. Menzies' notebooks do not represent the final form which he would have given to his composition. Sometimes they are little more than the sort of rough sketch which an author makes for no eye but his own; later on he goes over what he has jotted down, smoothing out roughnesses in the style and qualifying certain statements by means of footnotes or otherwise. The reader must make allowance for this, particularly in the second part. For example, when he reads about the relation of Calvinism to the Church of England, he may feel sure that Dr. Menzies would have taken care to bring out the fact that formally that Church, to all intents and purposes, disclaimed the Calvinistic theology. Again, there would have been a note upon the influence which Bucer's commentary on Romans seems to have exerted on Calvin's treatment of predestination.

The notes represent a draft, and the draft is also partial; that is the second consideration which ought to be borne in mind. The MS. ends just when it is approaching the heart of its subject. It is deeply to be regretted that Dr. Menzies did not live to indicate the outlines of his final views upon Calvinism as a system of theology. The biographical sketch has its own interest, but this estimate of the personality was simply meant to introduce the larger question of Calvinism itself, and Dr. Menzies died before he had done more than address himself to this problem. The consequence is that we miss discussions such as he intended to furnish, for example, of Calvin's opinion upon the Person of Christ and upon the Real Presence in the Eucharist; the English reader requires to turn, for the latter point, to an account like that in the fifth volume of Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (p. 567), and, for the former point—though the two are hardly to be separated—the student will refer to a discussion like that in the second volume of Thomasius' *Dogmengeschichte* (pp. 354 ff.).

One can only surmise what line Dr. Menzies would have taken in his final appreciation of Calvinism. It is unlikely that he would have shared the standpoint of Professor Hastie and Dr. Kuyper. But how far would he have agreed with Brunetière's essay in *Discours de Combat* or with Troeltsch's verdict in the *Hibbert Journal* for October, 1909? We guess and wonder, but that is all we can do. It is indeed tantalising to have missed his considered opinion, for there is singularly little, in modern theology, that can be regarded as first-rate criticism of Calvin's theology. Critics have arisen to show that Nestorius was not a Nestorian, and Erastus not an Erastian; no one has yet been brave enough to hazard the

hypothesis that Calvin was not a Calvinist. The subject has been spared this paradox, and yet few subjects have suffered more from conventional and superficial judgments. The type of ordinary allusions to Calvinism is a trial to the patience of those who happen to know something of it at first hand; the praise and the condemnation are so often out of focus that it would have been a real service to have had an appreciation of its merits and defects from one who brought to it the training and temper which are evident in Dr. Menzies' other work. As it is, we must supplement these notes by some of the essays thrown up by the Calvin quater-centenary in 1909, notably those contributed by Dr. B. B. Warfield and others to *The Princeton Theological Review* for that year, and, from a more detached position, by Professor M'Giffert in his *Protestant Thought Before Kant.*

The biographies to which Dr. Menzies alludes are by F. Kampschulte, who did not live to complete his work on *Johann Calvin, seine Kirche und sein Staat in Genf* (1869, 1899), and by E. Doumergue. The fourth volume of the latter's monumental biography, *Jean Calvin: les hommes et les choses de son temps*, was published in 1910. Doumergue's work resembles Masson's *Milton* in its scale and spirit. Kampschulte represents the less sympathetic, Roman Catholic position. Professor Williston Walker's book on Calvin appeared in 1906, and Mr. Hugh Reyburn's *John Calvin: his life, letters, and work* followed in 1914. When Dr. Menzies reviewed the latter book in his own *Review of Theology and Philosophy* (vol. x. p. 39), he took occasion to make a remark about Calvin's views of the Incarnation, which may be quoted here, to supplement the notes. Calvin, he observes, "had two doctrines of the Incarnation, the first, that with which he

started, in which that doctrine was a postulate of the Lord's position as a Saviour and the object of justifying faith, which appears in his first Catechism as in the Catechism of Luther, and is mainly relied on in the *Institutes*; the second, the orthodox doctrine of the Creeds which he formally accepted."

I have not thought it part of an editor's duty in this case to add any footnotes in order to correct statements in the text. Thus, when Dr. Menzies seems to imply that Calvin's feat of commenting single-handed on the entire Bible has not been equalled recently, the reader will at once recollect that men in our own country, like Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln and Matthew Henry, carried out the same task. It would be pedantic, I think, to interpolate corrections of this minor kind. And indeed it would not often be necessary. The notes are best left to speak for themselves. We all regret that there were not more of them, but we are grateful that it has been possible to recover even so much, and in this way to exhibit Dr. Menzies's wide range of interest.

JAMES MOFFATT.

I

THE CAREER AND PERSONALITY OF CALVIN

In matters of religion there is no doubt as to the importance of the individual in whom a new principle first declares itself, and under whose name multitudes in later generations are content to enrol themselves. The movement called Calvinism is not to be understood without a study of the life and character of its founder. From him it derives its doctrine, its Church discipline, its estimate of Scripture, its austere spirit, its fervent practical piety. He was the author, and in a sense the finisher, of Protestantism in France and French Switzerland, in part of Germany, in Scotland, in Holland, and in a great part of the New World. He is not to be regarded as a Saint; against that fate his writings will protect him, as those of all Reformers do. But in his personal history his followers see how the various parts of their religious system made their appearance and were welded into the rigid and effective organism they know. There can be no treatment of Calvinism which does not begin with an account of John Calvin. While it is true that no modern writer can hope adequately to measure and set forth so large a man, it is a duty the writer of a work on Calvinism owes to his subject and his readers, to make the attempt to do so. Let it be done with loyalty to the subject and with regard to the truth that is made known to this generation.

John Calvin was born at Noyon, in Picardy, on July 10, 1509. The inhabitants of Picardy were an independent, freedom-loving race, and the name of "Picard" was used like "Wycliffite" or "Hussite," of dissenters who accepting the creed were yet anti-clerical. Luther speaks in a sermon preached in 1516 of "our Picards and other schismatics." The men of Picardy were much given to discussion and fond of enforcing their views on others; the long catalogue of men of Picardy from the time of the Schoolmen to that of the Revolution shows the stuff of which they were made.

The Calvin family are ascending in the world when they come in sight. The grandfather of the Reformer was a boatman on the river Oise at Pont l'Evêque, not far from Noyon; his father, Gerald, had settled himself at Noyon as a man of business about the year 1480. The town had a Cathedral, and the Church bulked largely in it; but the anti-clerical spirit was also strong among the burghers. Gerald Calvin was a keen and clever lawyer who held many public offices, and was relied on both by the Cathedral Chapter and the leading families of the neighbourhood. He married the daughter of a former innkeeper, Jeanne le Franc, a woman distinguished for beauty and for piety, and the pair were in good repute and in comfortable circumstances. They had four sons, of whom John was the second, and two daughters. The mother appears to have died before the children grew up, and the house was darkened by difficulties which arose between the lawyer and the Cathedral staff about his stewardship of the estates left by some of the canons. He fell out of touch with the Church, and died in 1536 without the benefit of sacraments.

Of his youth Calvin tells us little; our information on

the subject is nearly all derived from the Life of him by Theodore Beza. He does tell us in his Admonition on Relics that he himself long ago kissed a relic of St. Anna at Uricampus or Ourscamp, in the vicinity of Noyon.[1] Some writers please themselves with supposing that Calvin was taken to adore the relics at Ourscamp by his mother. It is possible, but he says nothing of it, and indeed he never mentions his mother at all. He was a very obedient son to his father, by whom he allowed himself to be determined in the direction of his studies even when he was quite grown up; and his father deserved this from him, for he showed from first to last a great solicitude with regard to the education and advancement of his clever son, and arranged things skilfully for his advantage. John Calvin remained at Noyon till 1523, and went to the school of the Capettes, so called doubtless on account of the dress the scholars wore. He was made to associate even in these years with the sons of an influential Noyon family, the Montmors, who were related to Hangest, the Bishop of Noyon. Calvin's father was also able to secure his appointment, at the age of twelve, to a small post, carrying some little income, in the Cathedral at Noyon, and another such appointment followed some years afterwards. The duties could be discharged by another; the boy could not say Mass. The tonsure was administered to him in connection with his first Church office, but he never was ordained; all the tonsure indicated was that he was connected with religion and that the tie might become closer. The appointment of minors to Church offices which they could not fulfil personally was common in that age, not in France only.

[1] The pilgrimage Church of Ourscamp, now a ruin, is depicted in Doumergue (vol. i. p. 42).

What we see in this transaction is that Gerald Calvin wished his son to be a Churchman, and did his best for him with that view, though at a later time he changed his mind on the subject. The boy was placed in a family connected with the Church, and he began, to however small an extent, to eat the bread of the Church. He was sent away from home in the year 1523, when not yet fourteen years old, still with the Montmor boys and their tutor no doubt, that he might consort with people of superior manners and be fitted for any situation to which he might be called. His education was still at his father's expense, Beza is careful to inform us; the son did not figure as a dependent. But his father was ambitious for him, and put him in the way of a more liberal education than he would have had at home. We can only guess whether it pained him to have his son taken away from his family or whether, had the mother been alive, the separation would have taken place. For John Calvin's social position the step was a decisive one. He had from the outset of his life fine manners and the ways of good society, and consorted wherever he went with the best people, with scholars and nobles. He knew that he was a man originally of no family; he did not call himself, like Luther, the son of a peasant, but he spoke of the originally obscure and humble state from which it had pleased God to raise him.[1] Naturally shy and inclined to retirement, and without the gift of easy converse with the common people, he was fitted by his upbringing to mingle easily with the great and learned.

He spent five years at Paris, living in the house of his uncle Richard, but directed in his studies by the tutor. He was no doubt spared much of the hard and unsavoury

[1] Preface to *Commentary on the Psalms*, p. ix.

life which Rabelais describes to us by the mouth of Panurge, and which M. Doumergue sets forth at length, and he learned much. At the Collège de la Marche, where the first year was spent, he had for his teacher M. Cordier, of whom it was said "wherever Cordier teaches, *belles lettres* flourish";—Cordier, who had given up the first or highest class, with its prospects of promotion, to teach the fourth, "that he might not have it all to do over again"; and whose maxim it was that the teaching of good manners must accompany the teaching of Latin, and that boys should be taught from the first to speak and to write good Latin instead of the barbarous jargon they were accustomed to. The chaste and nervous Latin in which Calvin's works were composed is no doubt traceable in part to this root.

From the Collège de la Marche he was removed after a year, against his will, to that of Montaigu, a more ascetic institution, where the pupils dressed in black; silence was expected of them, and everything was governed by the rod. Here he was promoted to the study of dialectic; the students spent their time in constant dialectical disputes, and four years of such exercise could not fail to leave their mark on mental habits and literary style. In all these five years the biographers are agreed that Calvin fulfilled his religious and other duties with scrupulous exactness, and that no breath of scandal touched him. Whether he was a favourite with his fellow-students is indeed a question. Beza says that his father thought of theology for him because he was religious from his tender years and a severe censor of the vices of his companions. The school legend, that he bore among his companions the nickname of "the accusative," does not necessarily imply more than that he had a strict standard for himself and

tried to get others also to live up to it; it need not point to a habit of tale-bearing. We may be sure Calvin would not be guilty of a meanness, and we can understand that he felt in some degree devoted to the Church; he had the tonsure, which stood for good living; and his association with gentlemen carried him in the same direction. The question is also raised here whether he was friendly in disposition and attractive to his companions. Some writers declare that he was never young, that he had a hard character, and repelled rather than attracted. We can scarcely imagine him playing at any game, still less taking part in the boisterous revels which we know from Rabelais to have been a feature of Paris University life in his day; but he did attract many, and those of the best, and many a one who had known him in France followed him to Switzerland long after. The truth appears to be that he was naturally reserved and bent wholeheartedly on intellectual pursuits, but that those who penetrated his reserve found he had much to give them, and looked up to him and loved him.

He made friends of masters as well as of pupils. Of his friends we need only mention the three Montmors, Joachim, Yves and Claude, and the sons of Cop, first physician of Louis XII. and Francis I.

The years Calvin spent at Paris were the years which came immediately after the great acts of the German Reformation, and religious discussion must then have been at its height in France also. A few dates will make this clear. The ninety-five theses of Luther, attacking the system of indulgences, were fixed to the door of the Church at Wittenberg in 1517. The great tracts, "To the Christian Nobility of Germany," "The Babylonian Captivity of

the Church," and "The Freedom of a Christian Man," were published in 1520. The excommunication of Luther took place early in 1521, and Luther appeared before the Diet of Worms on April 17th of that year. The year at the Wartburg followed, in which the New Testament was translated by Luther into German. In the year before Calvin came to Paris, Luther returned to Wittenberg to apply himself at once to the arrangement of the Reformed Church there. These events naturally aroused loud echoes in France also. The Latin works of Luther were studied by French scholars, but his name and fame were everywhere and in every class of society, and powerfully furthered the movement of reform in France also. There was a movement of religious reform in France as well as in Germany; indeed, French writers claim that the French Reformation was in the field before that of Germany. The French Reformer was Le Fèvre, of Étaples, in Picardy, who was born about 1435, and was over seventy years of age when he turned his attention from Mathematics and Philosophy, of which he was Professor at Paris, to theology. In 1509 he published a translation of the Psalms, in the introduction to which strong evangelical sentiments appear, and in 1512 he issued a Latin Commentary on the Epistles of Paul, in which he speaks of the sovereign authority of God's Word and teaches the doctrine of justification by faith. These works did not amount, it is true, to an attack on the system of the Church. Le Fèvre's spirit was sweet and meditative, not controversial, and he still believed in the real presence and in purgatory. He impressed on French Protestantism the tendency it afterwards showed, to appeal to Scripture, to build on Scripture rather than on doctrine, and to be in sympathy with Humanism. But he sowed the seed from which, as much

as from the stirring events in Germany, a Protestant Church might and did arise on French soil. Farel was his pupil, the fiery, uncompromising reformer who, after adventurous wanderings in the south of France, betook himself to Switzerland and became the foremost champion of Reformed doctrine in the Western Cantons.

Thus, when Calvin came to Paris, a Protestantism of a kind already existed in France. King Francis I. and his sister, Margaret of Navarre, were in sympathy with the new movement, and did what they could to protect its preachers. Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux, who was in intimate correspondence with Queen Margaret, actively encouraged them, and helped to carry on a reforming propaganda in his diocese. The royal favour, however, which shone on the early stages of the French Reformation did not last, but was converted afterwards into hostility and persecution when the King met with misfortune and was forced to feel the need of conciliating the Papacy.

When the fires of martyrdom broke out in various places through the country, the students at Paris could not but hear of it, and the students of the College of Montaigu especially must have known that their Principal, Noël Béda, was foremost in urging the King to strong measures against the Lutherans and their books. The New Testament of Le Fèvre, published in 1523, and the Old Testament of 1528 were a special mark for Catholic persecuting zeal. All this Calvin must have heard of in his College; but of his views and feelings at the time he tells us nothing.

We have no means of knowing whether the tempestuous state of theology when his course of study came to a close had anything to do with the change which then took place in the aim to which he devoted himself. He speaks of it in the oft-quoted passage of the Introduction to his

Commentary to the Psalms. This Preface is dated 1557, twenty-eight years after the events it speaks of. Calvin is comparing himself with David, not with regard to his birth, which he confesses to have been humble indeed, but with regard to his experience, both as a man and as leader of a Church. After saying that his father destined him when yet a very little boy for the study of theology, he goes on, "But when he perceived that legal knowledge universally raised its cultivators to wealth and influence, the prospect it held out induced him abruptly to change his purpose. Thus it came to pass that, called back from the study of philosophy, I was reluctantly led to acquaint myself with law."

The change took place at the instance of the father, Gerald Calvin, and the reason he gave was that he saw that the law promised more of a career than did theology. But he might have seen this at any time before or after his son went to College; and it is impossible not to connect this decision with the growing difficulty he was finding at this time in his relations with the clergy at Noyon. He was less devoted as a Churchman than he had been; his actions as steward of the estates of deceased members of the Chapter were being called in question, and we know that he died out of communion with the Church. He may have seen that trouble was brewing for those connected with the Church, and he may have wished to spare his son; he may have foreseen the side his son would take if he went into theology.

Whatever the motive of the father, John Calvin played the part of an obedient son, and reluctantly, as he says, did as his father wished. He betook himself to the University of Orleans, arriving there early in 1528, and staying till

the spring or autumn of the following year. Theology was not taught at Orleans at all, and student life was gay. But Calvin's life there was not gay; master now of his own time and able to make his own arrangements, he showed that he had but one aim in life, and that everything must give way to his pursuit of it. "Some persons still alive," Beza tells us, "who were then on familiar terms with him, say that at that period his custom was, after supping very frugally, to continue his studies till midnight, and on getting up in the morning, to spend some time meditating and as it were digesting what he had read in bed, and that while so engaged he was very unwilling to be interrupted." The result, Beza says, was that he acquired solid learning and an excellent memory, but also he probably sowed the seeds of a weakness which afterwards brought on various diseases and ultimately led to his untimely death. The immediate result was that he at once took up a leading position in the University; discussed, in the circle of young jurists who became attached to him, the merits of rival teachers and systems in the new subject; was asked by Professors to represent them when unable to lecture, and on leaving was offered a degree without any expense on his part.

He migrated to Bourges to hear the Italian jurist Alciati, who had just been brought there, and who had the reputation of combining with profound knowledge of law as a science, a knowledge of its history and development. At Bourges he renewed the acquaintance, formerly made at Orleans, with Melchior Wolmar of Rothweil, a Humanist and a Protestant in all but name, who boarded students in his house and taught the Greek language. At his instigation, Calvin began to learn Greek. His Commentary on II. Corinthians was dedicated in 1546 to

Wolmar, his debts to whom are recounted in the Preface. No doubt there was sufficient opportunity both at Orleans and at Bourges to make acquaintance with the doctrines of the Reformation; many German students were there to whom the religious controversy was by far the most important thing in the world, and one of the three principal friends he made at Orleans, François Daniel, was linked to him afterwards by bonds of religious sympathy; but it was to law, not theology, that Calvin was devoting himself at these Universities.

After this year of the study of law, there follows a period of Calvin's life in which it is difficult to determine his movements, and equally difficult to trace with any precision the development of his mind. In the year 1531 he was in Paris and at Noyon; this year his father died, without comfort from the Church when living or honour when dead. At Paris Calvin was devoting himself to classical studies under the royal lecturers who were the beginning of the Collège de France, and whose appointment, quite independent of theology, was the triumph of the new learning in France. He studied Greek with Pierre Danès, and Hebrew with François Vatable.

The fruit of this new course of study appeared in 1532, when he published his Commentary on Seneca's two books *De Clementia*. Erasmus had edited Seneca and drawn attention to his importance; and Calvin undertakes this labour to prove his own scholarship and secure an established position for himself in the world of letters. That he succeeded in this is unquestionable; he shows himself acquainted with the whole of Greek and Latin classical literature, citing 155 Latin authors and 22 Greek, and citing them with understanding. He has read everything,

knows everything. The Bible, on the contrary, is cited only thrice; it is not as a Biblical scholar that the writer wishes to be known. Also he shows a maturity of judgment and a knowledge of public affairs which are remarkable in so young a man, and shows how quickly and how fully the world has opened itself up to his devoted study. Is there any practical point in the publication? Is it an appeal to the King on behalf of his Protestant subjects? It does not seem so. The work is that of a scholar who has found a work congenial to him to illustrate with his learning and to bring before the public; and he discusses subjects which occur in it, the duties of a King, the shortcomings of the Stoic view of life, and the superior Christian view which allows the affections to speak and does not forbid tears. But King Francis is not placed in the position of Nero, to whom Seneca addressed his treatise, and further than the general praise of tolerance as against intolerance, the work of Calvin does not seem to have any immediate bearing on the circumstances of his day. The work shows that Calvin had not yet given himself to theology; it is as a scholar that he wishes to be known.

In May or June Calvin is again at Orleans, and figures as the official representative of the nation of Picardy in the University. On the 23rd August in that year we find him at Noyon, where the plague is raging, and he has to take part in public religious acts bearing on that calamity. His older brother Charles is by this time coming to be in difficulties with the Chapter at Noyon; in the following year he is accused of a heretical opinion, and when he dies, in 1537, he is not reconciled to the Church. Is John Calvin moving in the same direction? There is no open breach as yet, but we see that he has been subjected to influences from many quarters which might tend to move

him away from the Church. When he returns to Paris he is in the midst of a widespread movement making for the new doctrine, both in the University and in the general population, and Calvin, both in his letters and in his actions, takes the part of the innovators. Light shines clearer on the situation before the close of 1533. On November 1st his friend Cop, son of the Royal Physician, has to address the University of Paris in connection with his inauguration as Rector. He takes for his subject the Beatitudes, and contrasts with other doctrines the Christian philosophy which is divinely communicated to man and which alone assures us that we are sons of God, raising us above the generality of mankind, as men are raised above the brutes. The old faith and the new are contrasted, the law with its threatenings, and the Gospel, which does not threaten but convinces us of the immense goodwill God bears us. These are positions familiar to Calvin, though here they are stated, as Professor Lang has shown, in phrases of Erasmus and also of Luther; and it admits of proof that Calvin was the writer of the Address, and put it in his friend's hands. Part of it, in fact, has been found in Calvin's writing. Thus we have him at this time drawing up and publishing in a marked way, causing to be addressed to the doctors of the Sorbonne who were on the University staff, a statement of Protestant doctrine which could not be mistaken.

Cop and Calvin were at once to learn that they had gone too far in thus seeking to commit the University to a Protestant manifesto. They were encouraged to do so by the progress the new doctrine had been making at Paris, and by the toleration extended to that doctrine. But a few days after the delivery of the discourse, the rector was accused before Parliament of heresy, and after vainly seek-

ing to shelter himself behind his University privilege, he took to flight. Calvin also fled, narrowly escaping arrest and leaving his papers behind, which fell into the hands of the authorities. He went, it seems, to Noyon, but hearing that Queen Margaret was intervening on his behalf, returned to Paris. But the air was too close for him there, and he entered on a course of wanderings in France. On May 4th, 1534, he was at Noyon, and gave up his Church offices. At the age of twenty-five it was required by Church practice that he should fully enter the priesthood if he was to retain these offices, and that period of his life had all but arrived.

These are the external events of Calvin's life, so far as known to us, from the time when his career as student at Paris came to an end to the time when he flung his challenge for the Reformed doctrine before the world in Cop's address. Does he tell us anything of the inner process by which he arrived at the Reformed position? Or can we draw any inferences from the position in which he was at various times and the influences he met with, as to the manner in which the great change in his views was brought about? It is easy to count up the external influences which may possibly have contributed to the result. Beza attributes a great deal to Calvin's relative, Peter Robert Olivétan, who translated the Old Testament from the Hebrew and published the translation at Neuchatel. He, Beza says, made Calvin acquainted with the Reformed faith, so that he began to devote himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and, from an abhorrence of all kinds of superstition, to discontinue his attendance at the public services of the Church. This statement is gravely doubted. Olivétan left France in 1528 to act as a mis-

sionary to the Vaudois, and did not return to France for many years. Calvin can scarcely have been a Protestant at heart during his juristic and humanist studies, though Doumergue accepts this from Beza. Again, his father and brother at Noyon were falling out of sympathy with the Church ; his father, who had turned his son's studies away from the Church, died excommunicate, and with his brother the same was to be the case. This might in some degree influence him. Of the men he met at Orleans and Bourges who might dispose him in favour of the Reformed views, the most prominent is Wolmar, who influenced Calvin's studies in a marked degree, and in reading Greek may have introduced him to the New Testament. At Bourges he certainly came in contact with men high in the Church who were open to the new light. But if he was influenced by any of these, how are we to explain his giving himself to humanistic studies, and his book on Seneca, which, as Kampschulte says, shows him to have aspired to a position like that of Erasmus or Reuchlin, rather than that of Luther or Zwingli? This appears an insurmountable obstacle to thinking him a Protestant at heart before the year of that publication.

Calvin gives an account of his conversion in the Preface to his Commentary on the Psalms already referred to, and in his reply to the letter of Cardinal Sadoleto to the Senate and people of Geneva of the year 1539. In the former work, after the passage cited above (p. 135) about his giving up theology for law at the instance of his father, he goes on,

> "God finally made me turn about in another direction by his secret providence. And in the first place, because I was so obstinately addicted to the superstitions of the papacy that it was very hard to draw me from

that deep slough, by a sudden conversion he subdued and reduced my heart to docility, which, for my age, was overmuch burdened in such matters. Having consequently received some taste and knowledge of true piety, I was forthwith inflamed with so great a desire to reap benefit from it, that, though I did not at all abandon other studies, I yet devoted myself to them more indifferently. Now I was greatly astonished that, before a year passed, all those who had some desire for pure doctrine betook themselves to me in order to learn, although I myself had done little more than begin."[1]

He then goes on to speak of the desire he had for quiet and retirement, which was constantly defeated by the many enquirers who sought him.

The conversion thus spoken of is put down to the immediate act of God ; preparations and approaches to it there may have been ; evidently there was a struggle before the final act took place, during which he felt inclined to leave the deep slough in which he was, *i.e.* the faithful and exact performance of all the religious duties and observances incumbent on a good Catholic, but he found his heart to be hardened, his determination firmly fixed to go on as he had been doing, faithful to the old system. He was in a state of doubt, but confirmed himself by an exercise of will in the position in which he was. This came to an end at a definite point of time, which he is able to recall and from which he dates subsequent occurrences. God, by a sudden conversion, subdued and reduced his heart to docility. He felt compelled to admit that in some points the new doctrine was true, and his heart ceased to be hard, it grew teachable instead ; he received more and more of

[1] The translation is that of Mr. Walker.

the new light. When did that take place? Most of the writers who have studied the subject agree in placing the conversion in the summer of 1533. Many connect it with the services at Noyon in which Calvin was forced to take part, and which he found unexpectedly distasteful. Others, it appears to me with more reason, point to his residence at Paris in the autumn of that year, and to the existence there of a considerable community enthusiastic for the new truth, with many of whom we know that he was intimate. Beza speaks of his relation with Stephen Forge, a distinguished merchant, whose house was the centre of the movement, and who suffered for his faith in 1534; and goes on to speak of Calvin devoting himself about this time to the cause of God. The year he spent at Paris up to November, 1534, would thus coincide with the year he speaks of in this passage, when, without wishing it, he came to be known as one in whom instruction in the new faith was to be found.

The statements in the reply to Sadóleto are to the same effect. They are not professedly autobiographical, but are put in the mouth of a layman supposed to be defending himself at the last judgment for being a Protestant. But they go so deep that they seem to be done from personal experience, and may be taken as telling us of what Calvin himself had come through. Here, as in the Preface to the Commentary on the Psalms, we read of one who was determined not to yield to the new light, yet was compelled to do so, whose conscience would not be satisfied by the performance of all the duties required by the Church, and was subject to terror which no satisfaction could cure; who leant an unwilling ear to the new teaching and strenuously resisted it, yet was forced at last to acknowledge that he had been all his life in ignorance and error.

From the period of Cop's address and the persecution which followed it, Calvin stands before us fully committed to the new doctrine and the cause. But he is now a wanderer; he is in hiding; he is sometimes under an assumed name. He is, in fact, never to come forward in France as a leader of the Reformation. He is a writer, and writing can be done anywhere. There is no shelter or safety for him in his own country. He goes from Paris to Noyon; then to Angoulême, where his friend Louis de Tillet cares for him. He is at Nérac, where Margaret has her court, to see the veteran Le Fèvre, whom she is protecting in his last days; he is at Noyon again; gives up his appointments there; is twice imprisoned there for short periods, we know not why. He is at Paris again on a very secret visit, and expects a visit from Servetus, who, however, does not appear. He is at Orleans again; then at Poitiers; apparently at Angoulême again, when the disturbance caused by the placards takes place; then he leaves France, his friend de Tillet accompanying him.

What are his views at this time? For what is he preparing himself? He is meeting men who are to be distinguished as leaders of the Protestant cause in France, some of them as its martyrs. He is engaged in study in the large library he found at Angoulême; he is writing sermons to be handed to the clergy in the neighbourhood to preach. He is hearing of the persecution of his friends, corresponding with persons who urge him to write, no doubt meditating what he will write, for some hold that the *Institutes* were begun by him while still in France, and the above-mentioned sermons for the clergy of Angoulême could not be very different from what he afterwards put forward.

He is, we are at least warranted in thinking, busily meditating on the position of the Reformation in France,

considering what requires to be done for it, and how a clearer and more definite position is to be won for it. Of literary output there is little. The only work he published in this period is *Psychopannychia*, Sleep of the Soul, which he wrote against the Anabaptists, to refute the opinion that the soul sleeps, without memory or sensation, from death to the day of judgment. He feels himself called to be a teacher of Christian doctrine, and this subject was much discussed, so that he regards it as a duty to deal with it. In this little work we find a different attitude and treatment from that of the *De Clementia*. He no longer writes as a Humanist, but as one who is guided by the Word, and who feels the cry newly arising from the blood of the martyrs being spilt around him.

If the *Psychopannychia* shows us Calvin at this time taking up the position of guide to the Protestants in matters of faith, there is a sketch of him, by a late historian it is true yet probably correct, assuming leadership in the matter of Protestant ritual. In a cave outside Poitiers he observed, with some of his friends, the rite of the Lord's Supper. After reading from the Gospels a passage describing the institution, and after denouncing the Catholic Mass as an institution of the devil, he invited the brethren in the words, "My brethren, let us eat the bread of the Lord in memory of His death and passion." Then they sit at the table; he breaks the bread and hands a piece to each, and they all eat without saying a word. The same with the wine. Then he returns thanks to the Lord for His goodness in making them know the abuses of papism and understand the truth. Then he says, the others with him, the Lord's Prayer and the Creed in Latin.[1]

[1] Doumergue, p. 460; Walker, pp. 121-122.

Calvin was not ordained a priest in the Roman Catholic Church, nor was he ever ordained in Protestantism, where he dispensed the Lord's Supper as a matter of course. We see his views developing before he left France with regard to ritual as well as doctrine.

The placards denouncing the Mass, which appeared in Paris on 18th October, 1534, roused an indignation which carried the King along with it into a career of active persecution. Calvin fled from his country and found refuge at Basel, where his friend Cop had gone a year before, where Erasmus still lived, where the Reformation had been adopted three years earlier, and where he was at liberty to work and to speak his mind. The first piece of work he did was connected with the French Bible of Olivétan, which appeared in 1535, with two Prefaces by Calvin, the first in Latin, the second in French.

A more important work was soon to follow, sooner than he at first intended. His eyes were on his native country; Francis had attempted to justify his persecution of the Protestants, which was deeply offensive to the Germans, whom he desired to have for his allies, by representing them as a set of anarchists bent on the overthrow of all things. This attack on the character of his massacred friends roused Calvin to indignation, and led to the speedy publication of a work he may have begun in France, his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. He tells us himself, once more in the Preface to his Commentary on the Psalms, that when he left his native country and removed to Germany he designed to live concealed in some obscure corner. But when it was represented that those so cruelly treated in France were no other than Anabaptists and perverse men who would overturn not religion only but all political order, he felt that his silence would be treachery,

and so published his *Institutes*, first that he might "vindicate from unjust affront his brethren whose death was precious in the sight of the Lord," and next that some sorrow and anxiety might move foreign peoples. These ends were more directly served by the letter to King Francis which he prefixed to the *Institutes*, in which the rapidly matured young man—he was in his twenty-seventh year—showed what metal he was made of by addressing the monarch respectfully yet boldly and unreservedly on behalf of those of his subjects whom he was allowing to be persecuted. The King is reminded that it is the characteristic of a true sovereign to acknowledge himself to be the minister of God; and admonished to remember that no kingdom can prosper which is not ruled by the sceptre of God, that is by his divine Word. The Protestants may be insignificant; they know that they are sinners, and they have nothing to boast of but God's mercy, by which, without any merit of their own, they are admitted to the hope of eternal salvation; yet their doctrine must stand, because it is not theirs but that of God and his Anointed, whom the Father has anointed King that all may serve him. He then turns upon the priesthood, who are the instigators of the persecution, and declares that they are not in earnest about religion, but that their only care is to keep their kingdom safe and their belly filled; and then he recapitulates the charges brought against Protestant doctrine: that it is new, that it is doubtful and uncertain, that it is not supported by miracles, that it is opposed to the Fathers. He takes up these charges one by one to refute them. The refutation consists in an appeal to early Fathers who condemn the errors of which the Church of Rome is so full, the celibacy of the clergy, the doctrine of transubstantiation, fasting, images, and the withholding of

the cup from the laity. The King is urged in conclusion to read the Confession which accompanies the letter and which is offered as a defence of the persecuted religion.

It was a noble Apology, free from exaggeration, convincing, yet sharp as steel; it showed Protestantism to possess a champion of wide views, of the highest skill in stating its cause, and of invincible courage.

The *Institutes*, as first published, were called by those who used the book a Catechism. The opening part is on the same plan as the short and the longer Catechisms of Luther, published in 1529, and takes up in the first three of its six chapters, the ten commandments, the creed, and the Lord's Prayer, which are expounded in a calm and simple style. The last three chapters are livelier and more controversial; in the fourth, baptism and the Lord's Supper are treated; in the fifth, the false sacraments of the Roman Church; and the sixth deals with Christian liberty, the powers of the Church and civil administration.

It may be convenient to mention here the earlier statements of the new doctrine which had appeared before that of Calvin. These are,

1. The *Loci Communes* of Melanchthon, first published in 1521.

2. Zwingli's *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione*, 1525, which contains much speculative matter; and

3. Farel's *Sommaire, c'est une brieve declaration d'aucuns lieux fort necessaires à une chacun Chrétien pour mettre sa confiance en Dieu et à ayder son prochain.*

Among all these attempts to state the substance of the new doctrine, that of Calvin stands out as the most masterly, the most thoroughly reasoned and most capable of standing on its own feet. It at once gave him a position as the foremost dogmatician of the day; and the first

edition was exhausted within a year. But the author found in this book the work of his life. It expressed better than any other all he had to say, and he made it his chief task to improve it till he brought it to the great and elaborate work by which he is now best known.

In its main outlines the doctrine is the same in the first as in the subsequent editions. The sovereignty of God stands in the front of it, the reality and the authority of God are stamped on every page. All the sum of the Gospel is said to be contained in these two heads, repentance and the remission of sins. On election this edition is brief: it is treated mainly on the basis of the assurance of salvation, and reprobation is only mentioned. The position taken up by the author as a teacher of Christian doctrine may be thus defined:

1. He holds the truths of Christianity contained in the Decalogue as a system of social as well as religious duty; in the creeds and the Lord's Prayer, as a standard of the pious life.

2. He regards the Word of God as the supreme norm of all that is Christian, as all the Reformers do. There is no appeal from the Word to any other authority. The Church is an institution for preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments. The ministers of the Church are preachers of the Word, and derive from that office all their power.

3. With regard to other Reformers, Calvin is quite independent. He teaches Luther's doctrine of justification by faith only, but differs both from Luther and from Zwingli in his views on the Lord's Supper.

We shall discuss the doctrine of Calvin in a separate place in this book, and shall there speak of the growth of the *Institutes* in the various successive editions. We have

now to follow the history of the Reformer after its first publication.

Immediately after his book was through the press, he set out on a visit to Italy. With his friend de Tillet he crossed the Alps; but he remained a very short time in that sunny land. What exactly it was that took him there is not very well made out; Beza says he went to visit the Duchess of Ferrara, and at the same time to pay his respects to Italy. Both reasons may be true. He was now free to spend some time in this way, and what scholar would not wish to see something of Italy? Renée, Duchess of Ferrara, was a daughter of Louis XII. of France and a cousin of Marguérite of Angoulême, whose interest both in learned men and in the new opinions she strongly shared. Though Calvin's visit to her Court was brief, it was followed by a correspondence which lasted all his life, and in which he showed himself the wise and firm adviser of a princess who was placed by her views in a difficult position. He said himself that he went to Italy only to leave it, but it is evident that his stay at Ferrara was dangerous for him; and by June, 1536, he was at Paris, which a change in the policy of Francis towards heretics made it possible for him to visit. The journey was for the sake of settling his affairs in France, with the intention of returning to Basel or Strassburg. He was accompanied on this journey by his brother Antoine and his sister Marie; but they found the roads blocked by operations of war, and made a long détour by Lyons, intending to proceed to their destination through Switzerland. From Lyons they came to Germany, intending to stay only one night there. But Providence ordained otherwise. Calvin was seen and recognised, probably by his friend de Tillet, and his presence in the

town was reported to Farel, then in difficulties about organising the new Church of Geneva. He came to Calvin's lodging, and did all he could by entreaties to persuade the traveller to remain and help him in his work. Calvin was unwilling to do so; he wished to go on with his studies in some place where there were opportunities for reading. But Farel was not to be turned aside from his object, "When he saw that he made no progress by entreaty, he fell to violent imprecation that God might curse my retirement if I shrank from rendering assistance in so great a necessity. Thus subdued by terror, I abandoned the journey I had undertaken." By this strange scene Calvin was gained for the work to which he was thenceforward to devote himself.

It is necessary that we should say a few words about the Reformation at Geneva and Farel's work there. What was the great necessity which drove Farel to such a vehement method in order to gain a recruit for his cause?

A glance over the history of the Swiss Reformation shows that the Cantons acted independently of each other in their religious concerns. The governing body of each Canton regarded religion as a matter for which it was itself responsible, and in which it lay with itself to issue decrees. The magistrates claimed power to punish priests who disregarded their decrees; they ordered the Mass to be replaced by the sermon; they ordered the removal of images and the secularisation of monasteries. The magistrates also exercised the right of enquiring into the private life of the citizens and of issuing sumptuary decrees. These things it is necessary to remember when we come to speak of the regulation of life and manners by the Church at Geneva. The Church claimed no power

and employed no method which had not been used in former times by the Canton.

Geneva came late in the Reformation of the Swiss Cantons. The change of religion in a Canton was often preceded by a public disputation, everything was gone into, and the Burgomaster or Town Council afterwards passed the decree which seemed to be indicated. The Reformation took place at Zürich, after two Conferences, in the year 1524; at Bern it took place in 1528; at Basel in the following year; at Neuchatel in 1530. That it came so late at Geneva was due partly to the character of the people of that city, partly to its proximity to Catholic France, and partly to the circumstance that the new views came from the North, the country of Luther. When Calvin came to Geneva in 1536, the city had just achieved its political independence as a democratic state, and at the same time had adopted the Reformation. The powers from which it worked itself free were, firstly, its own Bishop, who belonged to the house of Savoy. If Pierre de la Baume had been a man of strong character and if he had been able to keep his Church in the respect of the people, the Reformation need not have taken place at Geneva at all; but he was a weak and incompetent man, and the clergy under him were without learning or discipline, they could not, when called upon, defend their Church in public disputation. In shaking off the power of its Bishop, Geneva also shook off the power of Savoy. The Canton of Bern also would gladly have swallowed up Geneva, and was always at hand with political pressure and advice, but it differed much from Geneva in spirit and character. The narrative of the diplomatic struggle which issued, after many years, in the independence of Geneva, is told with admirable force and clearness in Kampschulte's *Johann*

Calvin (vol. i. 1869), along with the coming of the new doctrine to the town. The principal Apostle of the Reformation at Geneva was William Farel, pupil, as we saw, of Le Févre. Farel belonged to an old French family, and after an adventurous career as a preacher in several districts of Southern France, he came to the Canton of Bern, where he evangelised many places, and was accepted by the Government as a missionary of the new faith it had adopted. He was a little man, and not prepossessing in appearance. But he had an immense voice, and he feared no opposition. He knew nothing of compromise, and never thought of saving his skin. He took for his motto the words of Christ in Luke xii. 49, "Quid volo nisi ut ardeat," "What do I desire but that it (the fire) should burn?" He was great at a disputation; he represented the Reformation as defiant; he offered his life as the forfeit for his preaching, which frequently led to disorder. His printed works were few, as he was always preaching, and his sermons were extemporised. But he issued the *Manière et fasson* (a liturgical handbook) and a doctrine or catechism; and these show him to have possessed a nervous and flexible French style. He had a warm heart, and a very modest estimate of his own powers.

The story of Farel's mission at Geneva under the protection of the Canton of Bern, which extended from 1552 to May, 1536, is told in detail by Kampschulte, and forms excellent reading. The magistrates tried hard to maintain a neutral position towards religion; the allied Canton of Fribourg was urging Geneva not to desert the old religion, while the opposite counsel came from Protestant Bern, which insisted that Protestant worship should be maintained, and that Roman Catholic preachers who spoke ill of the new doctrine should be punished. We hear of the

constitution of the Evangelical community in a private house; of the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the simplest fashion; of the first baptism at the hands of Viret, afterwards of Lausanne; of the taking possession of one Convent Church, then of another and another. A public discussion is arranged, but no champions appear on the side of the old Church. On Sunday, 21st May, 1536, the Reformation is officially accepted by the people, collected as a body; and this is the beginning of the political independence of Geneva. The citizens consider and resolve as to their mode of life, whether they will live according to the Gospel and the Word of God, Mass being abolished and daily preaching taking its place. To this they lift up their hands and promise and swear to God. The Edict in which the Reformation was accepted goes on to establish the principle of compulsory and gratuitous education for all the children of the community.

In July Calvin arrives, and Farel lays hold of him. What had happened in these two months to throw Farel into such anxiety? Nothing but the natural working out of the situation occasioned by the change of religion in a city which had at the same time achieved its political independence. Though the Genevans had vowed that they would live according to the Gospel, there was much to be done before they came actually to do so. The Roman Catholic religion was not dead. The priests and nuns had been sent about their business, but no new organisation of religion was ready to take their place. An Order of Worship was called for, a creed, a Church constitution. Many of the old families adhered to the old religion, and were driven to celebrate its rites privately. The priests would not go to hear the preaching; many laymen of the highest position in the town also refused to

go. There were also Protestants of liberal views who shrank from the religious tyranny threatening their town. And, in addition to all these difficulties, there was the further question, in what hands the government of the Church was in future to lie. In Bern and in other Swiss Cantons the civil magistrate treated the ministers as their servants and ordered how the rites of the Church were to be conducted. But in Geneva it was still to be settled whether that was to be so, and to Farel and his friends it seemed that, as the Reformation was their work, power in the Reformed Church ought to belong to them. At first things went easily; whatever Farel suggested was done by the magistrates, what he asked was given. The magistrates wished it to appear that they were liberal patrons of the Church, and did nothing fitted to raise awkward questions. But the situation was a strained one, and Farel had not the gifts to deal with it. When he found Calvin at Geneva, his anxiety drove him to the strongest measure to make him stay there. "Subdued by terror," Calvin tells us,[1] "I abandoned the journey I had undertaken; so however, that conscious as I was of the bashfulness and timidity of my nature, I would not build myself to discharge any definite office." After a short journey to Basel on business, on which he falls in with Churches which wish to see him, and is thinking of the French translation of the *Institutes*, he is at Geneva again in the end of August, to face the problem of the organisation of the Church there. The government had asked on May 20th that articles regulating Church affairs should be prepared; and the main part of this work was to fall on him. He did not for some time assume the office of the pastorate; he styled himself

[1] Preface to the *Commentary on the Psalms*.

"Professor of Sacred Literature in the Church of Geneva," and he expounded the Epistles of Paul in the principal church (St. Peter's) at an afternoon hour, and "with much approbation and usefulness." No salary was paid him for half a year after his coming, and then on the most humble scale. His life was very full. He took part in the discussions and deliberations held at various places to settle the future of religion. There is a disputation at Lausanne early in October, 1536, attended by half the priests of the Canton, only four of whom lift up their voices, and he speaks on the question of the real presence, quoting the early Fathers for the view that the body and blood of Christ is partaken of spiritually in the Lord's Supper, the link between them and the believer being the presence of the Spirit. Many priests accepted the new doctrine and the new position, and the Reformation was ratified at Lausanne on 24th December. He was at Bern in the latter part of October at a Synod called to consider the Wittenberg formula of Concord, and pled that Switzerland ought not to break off from other Protestant lands. Bucer and Capito express, after this, their strong wish to make his acquaintance.

But the chief interest of his early life at Geneva is to be found in the articles on the government of the Church, which appear to have been submitted to the Council, read and adopted in principle on November 10th, and brought forward again in their final form on 10th January, 1537. It is very important to note the point from which this Church constitution starts. It begins with speaking of the Lord's Supper. In the early Church the rite was observed at every Church service, and it is thought very desirable that it should take place not two or three times a year, but at least every Sunday, "considering the great

consolation the faithful receive from it and the fruit which proceeds from it in every way." If this appear to be making it too common, "at least the Holy Supper should be used every month." But who is to be admitted to take part in it? It is a matter of the utmost solicitude that this Holy Supper, ordered and instituted to unite the members of our Lord Jesus Christ with their leaders and each other in one body and spirit, should not be stained by the participation in it of those whose bad and evil life declares that they in no wise belong to Jesus. They who have the power to arrange the matter are bound to see that those who come to communion are, as it were, approved members of Jesus Christ. For this reason our Lord has placed in his Church the correction and discipline of excommunication; that those of a disorderly life, who, when warned, refuse to amend, should be rejected from the body of the Church. It is not the excommunication belonging to the old Church, so much abused, that is pled for, but that the rule should be re-established, the danger of its abuse being guarded against.

And how is this result to be secured? The government is requested to elect men of good life, well reputed among the faithful and not liable to be corrupted, who shall have an eye on the morals of the community, and shall inform some of the ministers about any notable vice that comes to their notice. If the person in question, being remonstrated with, shows amendment, then the discipline will have justified itself. If not, the minister, with the concurrence of his lay advisers, is to denounce him publicly to the congregation; if he perseveres in the hardness of his heart, then it will be time to excommunicate him; he is to be excluded from communion, and the brethren are to cease from friendly intercourse with him. But he is still to come

to the preaching. Neighbours and relations also are to warn the evildoer. If he laughs at excommunication, the Council are to consider how long they will tolerate such contempt of God and of his Gospel. We note that it is with the Council that the ultimate decision rests; it is they who are to excommunicate.

Along with this constitution, two other documents were presented for approval—a Catechism and a Confession of Faith. The Catechism was written by Calvin himself, and he cites it in a dispute we have still to speak of, which took place at Lausanne towards the end of February. Such a book was a new feature of religious life. In the Roman Catholic Church the god-father undertakes, as in the Anglican Church, to teach the child brought up for baptism the ten commandments, the creed and the Lord's Prayer, which he recites in its name, and the child comes to the priest when these are learned and is received in Confession. There were "short questions" for children among the Vaudois; Luther published his questions in 1529, his long and his short Catechism, the latter of which is still used in Germany. Calvin's Catechism was lost till recently. It came to light, and was published by Rilliet and Dufour in 1878. It is not in the form of question and answer, but is an abbreviated version of the *Institutes*, which themselves were at first called a Catechism. It is Calvin's first French work, written in a solemn tone, but by no means cold or dry, and contains charmingly simple and spiritual passages, as for example, on the petition, Give us this day our daily bread; "By which petition we commend ourselves to the providence of the Lord, and place ourselves in his care, that he may nourish and support and preserve us. For this good Father does not disdain to receive even our body into his protection and care, so as to exercise our trust in him

by slight and little things while we look to him for all we need to the last crumb of bread and drop of water."

The title of the third document is "Confession of the faith which all the citizens and inhabitants of Geneva and subjects of the land are to swear to defend and hold, extracted from the instruction used in the said city." It shows clearly the design which the Confession is drawn up to serve. The Articles explain how the object is to be carried out. "It would be an act of Christian magistrates," it is there said, "if you would make confession each for himself in your Council. Your example would show what everyone would have to do after you. Then do you appoint some of your company who being associated with some minister may require everyone to do the same, and this will be only for this time, since nothing has yet been done to determine what doctrine each one holds, which is the right commencement of a Church."

These documents are the programme from which Calvin did not afterwards swerve. The whole population, magistrates first, then all the citizens, are to be taken as bound to the Confession, based on the Catechism, which sets forth the doctrine of the *Institutes*. The magistrates are to see that this is done and are then to help the ministers to see that everyone shall live up to the standard set. The motive of the whole is connected with the administration of the Lord's Supper; the ministers are to be assured that no one participates who is unworthy to do so; this their conscience requires. The magistrates are to assist them. Thus a pure Church is to be established, a Church in which every member has personally accepted the doctrine, and the State helps the Church to get its ideas carried out. It must be allowed that the object of the ministers was not the strict

orthodoxy alone of all the members, but also that they should live well. It was life according to the Gospel that they were bent on securing, not conformity to their whole theological system, which was still in process of growth. The exercise of discipline was to be in the hands of the Church, in order that the ministers might do their duty to the homes entrusted to them, and the Church was to be backed up by the State.

It was only at Geneva that this attempt could have been made. In the other Cantons the magistrates had already taken the administration of religion into their own hands, and treated the ministers as their servants. But Geneva, having just obtained political liberty, was in want of a Church constitution, and was prepared to take up a position of its own in that matter; so the field was open.

The student is at first apt to be surprised when he finds that Calvin, who is about to impose a creed on the whole population of a city, is at this very time himself accused of heresy. Before any steps could be taken to receive the assent of the Genevese to his Confession, the charge is brought against him that he is teaching Arianism, that he does not teach the doctrine of the Trinity in the form arrived at by the Church, that the terms Person, Hypostasis, and Trinity are not used by him. Peter Caroli, now senior minister at Lausanne, doctor of theology, prior of the Sorbonne, one of the first French priests to join the Reformation, was the principal author of this charge, which caused great excitement both in the parties assailed and throughout the Protestant Churches of Switzerland and Germany. Calvin afterwards wrote a *Defensio*, from which the incidents of the fray at Lausanne, at Bern, at

Bern again, stand out with the utmost clearness. We see Calvin enraged, demanding to be cleared from so odious a charge, and appealing, in refutation of it, to the Catechism just printed at Geneva. To which Caroli rejoins: Never mind the new Catechism; let us sign the three old creeds (the Apostles', the Nicene, and that of Athanasius). This Calvin refuses to do, the Athanasian Creed being unauthentic and the Nicene clearly appearing from its rhythm to be a hymn or meditation rather than a creed. At a later meeting he explains his position with all needful definiteness, saying that it is difficult to know God in his essence, that all kinds of errors are made in the attempt, and that those who accept Scripture as their supreme rule and are unwilling to be led beyond Scripture, occupy safe ground. If there must be a creed, let it be in words really conformable to biblical truth and offering as little as possible of the asperities which may offend Christian ears. The highest appeal is to the Spirit, which gives a knowledge that is practical and remote from idle speculation. And he proclaims "that divinity of Christ which we have learned from the certain experience of piety." He is accused of not using the words "Trinity" and "Person," but neither he nor Farel nor Viret has any objection to these words. His *Institutes* prove it; so does the Confessio Helvetica (1536), which they have all signed. Only, they do not wish faith to be bound to words and syllables. Calvin and his friends "do not wish to introduce into the Church the tyranny that one should be bound, under pain of being held a heretic, to repeat words dictated by someone else."

It was Farel whom Calvin was defending as well as himself. Farel had printed a Catechism in 1524 or 1525, in which there was little express teaching about the Trinity

and though Calvin spoke in his *Institutes* (1536) of the Trinity and of Persons, the words do not appear in the Catechism of 1537 nor in the Confession of that year.

Caroli, rolling out the sentences of the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds, swaying his body and his head to the various clauses, moved the Synod, which met at Lausanne on May 14, to laughter. By the action he took he brought his career at that city to an end, for past actions were brought up against him altogether inconsistent with the ministerial position, and he had to disappear. He oscillated during the rest of his life between the Catholic and the Evangelical faith, and was four times converted from the one to the other.

Though absolved from the charge of heresy, Calvin and Farel found their position seriously weakened both in Switzerland and Germany by this occurrence. In treating of Calvin's doctrine we shall have occasion to discuss the two manners of his teaching on the Trinity and the Person of Christ. It is enough to remark here that in his teaching on the subject in the *Institutes*, where he upholds the traditional doctrine of the Church, he is less of a Reformer than in those passages of his writings where he does not go beyond Scripture and treats the doctrine of Christ as a part of the doctrine of salvation. No one would suspect Calvin of any deliberate heresy; it was necessary for the cause of the Reformation that it should be orthodox. But there were motives in it drawn from deeper springs than those of convention or expediency.

This episode did not tend to confirm the position of Calvin and Farel at Geneva. It began to look as if they had pitched their aims too high and committed themselves

to a policy which could not be carried out. The Genevan Reformers were not natives of Geneva, and many of their countrymen from France had followed them and were in their confidence. Members of old Genevan families could not but feel it strange that an authority of such extraction should presume to bind them to the Decalogue and should overlook their baptism, which made them already Christian people, and that Geneva should be selected for the renewal of the covenant with Moses and that of the days of Joseph. The Council did all it could to get the Articles accepted by the population, but it was a difficult undertaking, and even threats of banishment did not avail. Besides, the Councillors were near the end of their term of office. When the elections came in February, 1538, the character of the magistracy was decisively changed, and Calvin and Farel found themselves in opposition—a result they had striven to avert—and the stream of public sentiment running strongly against them. The occasion which led to their open defeat came from outside. The Reformation at Bern had kept up some usages of the old Church which had been abolished at Geneva. Baptism was there administered in the baptistry; unleavened bread was used at Communion; four festivals were observed, Christmas, Easter, Ascension and Pentecost. The French-speaking places in the territory of Bern followed the example of Geneva, discarding such observances. Bern wished to bring about uniformity, and applied to Geneva to accept these rites. To the eye of Calvin, as indeed of all concerned, the points were of small importance; only, matters of ritual ought not to be regulated by civil but by ecclesiastical authority. After discussions at various places, in which the clergy of Geneva and of Bern were both betrayed into great excess of language, a synod held at Lausanne on

31st March, 1538, decided that the Bernese usages should prevail. Calvin and Farel did not speak, but expressed themselves in private as willing to accept this decision if a general meeting of the Church should adopt it. This plea, however, was disregarded ; Bern notified to the Council of Geneva the result of the Lausanne synod, and asked for the adoption of it at Geneva. The magistrates put it to the ministers, who at once refuse totally. The magistrates resolve to apply to other preachers who will be more accommodating. The blind Coraud, of Calvin's way of thinking, denounces the magistrates from the pulpit, and is at once sent to prison for so doing. Calvin himself has, from the pulpit, called the Council a "devil's Council." Calvin and Farel, going to the Town House to remonstrate against the treatment of their colleague and the encroachment on the liberty of the pulpit, are asked if they will obey the orders of Bern, which they cannot do. This is the 20th April ; the following day is Palm Sunday, when it has been decreed that the Lord's Supper shall be administered in the Bernese form. The town officer is sent to ask if they will preach and administer the rite in the terms of the Bern missive. They refuse, and are forbidden to occupy the pulpit next day. A stormy night ensues ; for several nights the populace had been on the streets with firearms, which they discharged before the houses of the ministers, an experience which Calvin never afterwards forgot. On the Sunday Calvin and Farel defy the prohibition of the Council and ascend the pulpits of the two principal churches, their friends escorting them with arms. The Supper is not administered because of the prevailing disorders, the ministers explain the blasphemies and mockeries of God and of his Gospel. The Council meet the same day and refuse to hear the preachers, and on the following

Tuesday, April 23rd, pass the decree that Farel and Calvin are to leave the town within three days. The answer of the preachers is inscribed in the minute:

"Very well; if we had been servants of men we should have been ill-rewarded, but we serve a great Master, and he will reward us." And they left Geneva before the three days expired. At first they felt relief at quitting a town where they had suffered so much; and the people of that town also showed relief at getting rid of them. But the Reformers could not regard what had happened as final, and at once applied to Bern to get themselves restored. The treatment they received at Bern was not cordial. The statements of the Genevese magistrates were preferred to theirs, and the Bern ministers met them with reproaches and threats. But a change came; and on May 18th they were on their way to Geneva with an embassy which was to treat for their restoration. But Geneva did not want them; a league from the town they were met with a message forbidding them to enter it, and they had to face their exile, leaving Bern without a farewell and in a state of painful excitement. Calvin came first to equanimity, and comforted himself by reflecting that it was an act of Providence for which they suffered and that it was a religious duty to submit to it. That in principle he had been right, and that the principle he had upheld was certain to prevail, he never doubted for a moment.

Bucer had at once, on Calvin's parting from Geneva, invited him to go to be minister of the French Church at Strassburg, a little church in point of numbers, but embracing among the refugees, of whom it was mainly composed, many distinguished men. Calvin was not inclined to undertake again the pastor's office; the treatment he had

met with at Geneva was too dreadful. But Bucer repeated the invitation, and compared Calvin with Jonah, who fled from the commandment of the Lord. This, like the threat of Farel, proved effective with Calvin, who suddenly made up his mind and went where he was called. He was in Strassburg by the middle of September, 1538, and was to remain there three years. He was thus a citizen of a large independent community, surrounded by many able and distinguished men, who knew how to value him; he was in the midst of the world in which the city played a great part and showed a bright example of public spirit and educational enlightenment, and to which many resorted from every quarter. We may name Bucer, head of the German Reformed Church in the town, in relations with all the leaders of the Reformation, a little man with an enormous power for work, and, though not well paid, exercising a large hospitality.

One fact to be noticed here is that Caroli came to Strassburg, and though Calvin kept out of his way, he was thrown into violent agitation by the visit, and let his friends see the weak side of his character.

At Strassburg we see Calvin as pastor, and can note the views he held regarding the pastoral office and the way in which he discharged its duties. He received no ordination; neither he nor Farel entered office by the imposition of the hands of ministers. He did not regard the imposition of hands as a necessary step to the ministry. At Geneva and at Strassburg he was called upon by the first minister of the Church to enter on sacred functions, the people and the civil authorities concurring in his call; he had no doubt as to the validity of his ministry, and no one ever had a higher estimate than he of the solemn responsi-

bility attaching to the office. He was much more than a preacher ; he has boldly to use every means, in the service of the Word, lest the blood of those committed to his charge should be required at his hands ; he has to build up the house of Christ, to demolish the kingdom of Satan, to feed the sheep, kill the wolves, instruct and exhort the docile, argue with, lay hold of and convince the rebellious, all in the Word of God. He expended an immense activity in his pastoral duties ; preached four times a week to his own congregation and evangelised outside his Church, converting anabaptists, one of these being Jean Stordeur, whose widow he afterward married. He administered the Lord's Supper according to the local rite, and laboured, though not obtrusively, for the establishment of discipline, announcing from the pulpit that no one would be received at the table who had not offered himself for examination. Sentences are on record [1] of the unbending sternness he showed to the unworthy. In his letters he appeared, however, to be coming to see that toleration and goodwill are desirable for the Church ; that members are not to be cut off till they themselves make it inevitable. He writes to the Church at Geneva that the Lord's Supper is to be received at the hands of those who succeeded him and of his friends in office there ; that difference of views does not make them cease to be pastors if, on the whole, they preach the Gospel. He has cast away anger and has come to large and statesman-like views. His heart is still with his old Church.

One signal proof of this must be mentioned. Cardinal Sadoleto, Bishop of Carpentras, a learned and liberal man, seeing the condition of the Church at Geneva, bereft of its founder and at variance with itself, wrote a letter in Latin to the Senate and people of Geneva, in which he endeavoured

[1] See Doumergue, ii. 413, 414.

to bring them back to that allegiance to the Pope which they had thrown off not so long ago.[1] The letter is unimportant in itself; its argument is somewhat thin and trivial; the abuses in the Church are not mentioned; only a vague general argument is given to show that the old way was better. But the letter contained a personal attack on Calvin, scarcely disguised in the figure of a dissident Christian who is put up, after the obedient son of the Church has given an account of himself, to defend his position before the divine judgment seat at the last day. Calvin was asked by the Bern ministers to write a reply, and his Answer to Cardinal Sadoleto's letter is one of the best things he ever wrote, vibrating throughout with the strong feeling of the Protestant cause. It is important, biographically, for Calvin's account of his career and for its exhibition of the motives which guided him.

Calvin acted at Strassburg as a Professor as well as a minister, lecturing three days a week. His University salary was at first a florin a week. He published much while at Strassburg; the second edition of the *Institutes*, at which he had been working since they first appeared, was published in 1539, and the translation into French in 1541. These are works of immense labour. His Commentary on Romans appeared also in 1539, and a little familiar treatise on the Lord's Supper, in French, in which he points out the mistakes made in this matter by Luther, Œcolampadius and Zwingli, without any acerbity; a conciliatory work.

If the three years at Strassburg thus brought comparative repose from strife, an independent and secure position, and

[1] Calvin's Tracts (Calvin Translation Society, p. 1. Calvin's reply follows it in this volume).

an opportunity not found at Geneva for literary activity, they also brought a sharp experience of poverty. He sold his books at Geneva, and we find him writing about small sums due to him. These trials were not able to paralyse him nor to interfere with his literary activity. And he was never an ascetic either in principle or, when means allowed, in practice. He was driven to keep boarders; some of them were students whom he regarded as the rising hope of the Church, and for whom, hard as their life necessarily was with him, he had great and understanding sympathy; some of them were outsiders, who helped somehow to keep the pot boiling. He had made up his mind to marry, and he might have made a rich marriage, but he turned away from it. In August, 1540, his marriage took place with Idelette de Bure, widow of the converted anabaptist spoken of above. She was good and honest, Farel says, and adds, "I will also say pretty." She lived with him eight years, and made him very happy. She had two children by her former marriage, and presented Calvin with at least one child.

It was while Calvin was at Strassburg that the famous Colloquies took place, by which it was hoped that the breach might be removed between Romanism and Protestantism, and religious unity restored in Germany. Calvin was present at these interesting if inconclusive gatherings. He went to Frankfurt, where the Imperial conference was held in February, 1540, to prepare the subject of the Colloquies, partly to make the acquaintance of Melanchthon, with whom he continued afterwards in warm friendship, partly to do what might be possible in the interests of the Protestants of France. His correspondence shows him to us at the Colloquies at Worms, Hagenau and Ratisbon, of the last of which he wrote an account. We see him gaining an

insight into the position of the Reformation in Germany, and keenly interested both in the theological and the political movements of it. He was much thought of as a great theologian, and princes and statesmen sought his acquaintance. He gives us shrewd estimates of the persons prominently engaged in the proceedings, and of the forces acting on the Emperor, from whom he did not expect much, and of the German princes and cities. He himself was little inclined to compromise, and acted as a steel girder on men of more yielding temper, like Bucer and Melanchthon. The Catholic legates and statesmen he judges very sharply, not giving them credit for desiring any agreement, save on the terms that all should submit to Rome and accept from her such regulation of Church life as she might then grant. Some of them deal in threats of war, some hope to gain their ends without bloodshed. He comes to know the German Churches, their want of unity, their subservience to little Courts, their want of strictness in discipline. That he was trusted by the German Protestants and judged to be well acquainted with their affairs, appeared some years afterwards, when he was asked to draw up a statement of their case, to be presented to the Emperor at a new diet which he summoned to meet at Speyer in 1540 to make a fresh attempt for the regulation of religion. The result was the *Supplex Exhortatio* or Humble Appeal, on Christianity and the Reformation of the Church, which, if it did not move the Emperor, stands as a profound and solemn appeal to the root-principles of Protestantism. In this work, as much as anywhere else, Calvin's central thought is to be found.

The young Reformer wearied of the Ratisbon Colloquy before it was over. He did not know German, the language chiefly employed in the proceedings ; and he was

much dissatisfied with the influence the Catholics were able to exert. Another reason for wishing himself back in Strassburg was that the plague was raging in that city, and he was tormented with anxiety about his wife and household.

During all this time he had not been forgotten at Geneva. Things were in a tangled state there. The party which had brought about the banishment of Calvin and Farel had lost influence and fallen from power, mainly through blundering in negotiating a treaty with Bern; the party in sympathy with Calvin had grown in strength. The headless state of the Church had encouraged Cardinal Sadoleto to his attempt to bring Geneva back to the Roman allegiance, but while Calvin acted as the advocate of his former Church against this attack, he was not in sympathy with his successors in the ministry there, who were by no means equal to the position in which they found themselves. Farel advised that the communion should not be received at the hands of unworthy ministers, though Calvin, as we saw, gave the opposite advice. Religion was losing influence at Geneva; and from 1539, the year after Calvin left, to September, 1541, the desire grew stronger and stronger that the city should become again what it had been for a short time, a respectable Protestant state, and that Calvin should if possible be brought back. We have seen that he was otherwise occupied, but the invitation came to him again and again, and was backed up by appeals from other Swiss Churches and from many of his personal friends. The party favourable to him was now at the head of affairs, and was entertaining proposals for looking after the morals of the city in a way he would approve of, and by arrangements not unlike those he afterwards instituted. In May, 1541, the decree which banished him was formally revoked.

Farel, though not asked to accompany him, showed the modesty and generosity of his character by repeated letters urging him to return. At last a formal embassy came from Geneva to Strassburg to invite him. Very unwilling he was to go back to a city where he had suffered so much and had felt his life in danger; Geneva was the last place in the world where he desired to be. Strassburg did not wish to lose him, and urged him to remain there. Yet he yielded, and somewhat suddenly. As he had bowed to Farel's obsecrations and consented to stay at Geneva when he first came there, and as he had allowed himself to be overborne by Bucer's comparing him to Jonah, and had gone to take up public life at Strassburg, so now he bowed his head and recognised in the urgent summons of Geneva and the clamour of his friends, the expression of God's will, which he could not but obey. One thing he stipulated before he went; that the Church at Geneva should be a Church of strict discipline, and that the right of excommunication should be in the hands of its ministers.

He arrived at Geneva on September 13th, 1541.

In Geneva Calvin found at his return in 1541 a willing people. The magistrates had already begun before he came to make regulations in his spirit for the visitation of the town with a view to the correction of manners. At once, when he arrived, he waited on them, explained the delay of his arrival, and asked for the appointment of some of their number to co-operate with the clergy in drawing up a constitution for the Church. He was received most honourably; a house was given him, which had formerly been occupied by one of the Canons of the Cathedral; a salary was appointed to him in amount double that of the other ministers, to enable him to enter-

tain foreign visitors to the town, and a new coat was ordered for him. His salary, five hundred florins, with the gifts in kind which were occasionally added, never made him rich, but the poverty of Strassburg was at an end. He began his public ministrations as if nothing had happened, and treated the other ministers, though he disliked some of them, with graciousness. He even appears, from expressions in his letters, to have been surprised himself at his own moderation, and thinks that it will smooth his path.

His ideas, however, of what the Church was to be made, and of the means to be adopted to that end, were quite unchanged. Was it possible that the attempt made in 1537, by which Bucer had said he had ruined the Church there, should now succeed? It might do so; the hindrances which had formerly stood in his way were to a large extent removed. The civic revolution to which his return was due, had placed the party which was friendly to him at the helm of the state; the opposing party had few men of weight and power left to it. The neighbouring Cantons had concurred in his recall. His writings at Strassburg had made him, even more than before, the leader of the Reformation of the French, and had brought him the esteem and friendship of the German Reformers. Geneva was a new state, a small town in which a man of Calvin's attainments and even will might go far. He had been recalled by men who knew what his principles were, and what they had to expect from him; his Church system was elaborately set forth in the new edition of his *Institutes*, every detail of it based on an array of Bible texts, which showed that he must stand by it. No doubt he had learned much in Germany; he had been able to reflect on his former failure and the reasons of it, and had been in

contact with men who held the easier German views of the Church. He was inclined to moderation, and showed it in his first period at Geneva. But his views were not changed; and what we are now to see is how the attempt of 1537 was repeated by the maturer man of gathered power, and, after many a vicissitude, in which his cause seemed all but lost, at last prevailed, till he was master of the field and could hand over to his successors a completed work.

We have first to sketch the system Calvin brought Geneva to accept, and to estimate the nature of his influence in this work.

The great work of Doumergue has only reached (in the part now published) the point of Calvin's arrival at Geneva in 1541, and does not enter on the subject we have now to consider. Kampschulte has an admirable set of chapters, in which the minutes of the Council are very fully made use of, and also certain MS. notes of Calvin. His anti-Calvin tone, natural in a Catholic and also due to his connection with an old Geneva family, has sometimes to be recognised and allowed for. The fourth book of the *Institutes* is here important.

The conferences at once proposed by Calvin when he returned began immediately, and the Constitution of the Church drawn up in the *Ordonnances Ecclesiastiques* was adopted by the Council on 2nd January, 1542. It was not put in print; the earliest printed copy known to Kampschulte is of the year 1561, and contains additions, as the Council minutes show. Let us see what kind of a Church was prescribed for Geneva; a short statement may follow on the civil legislation, which was put in hand

immediately afterwards, with the assistance of Calvin, asked and given.

The Church has four orders of officials, more or less in the order of sanctity:

1. Ministers or preachers.
2. Teachers, who belong to the body of ministers.
3. Lay elders.
4. Deacons, those who have charge of the poor and those in charge of the hospitals.

The first class are very much the most important, and occupy a position scarcely equalled by any other body of clergy. "Honourable" is the title given them; "the honourable company," that of their body. The office is well hedged about with precautions against its unworthy assumption, and it is clothed with great and peculiar powers. To be a worthy minister one must have a call, then one must be examined, chosen and instituted, each by the proper authority. The examination, of course, is by the preachers, and has regard to learning, orthodoxy, earnestness, life and conduct; in striking contrast to the loose and perfunctory examination customary in the old Church. The choice belongs, in form at least, to the congregation; the shepherd is not to be thrust upon the flock, but chosen by them. He was to be named by the College of Ministers, and named to the little Council, then he was to preach and the congregation to agree to his institution. His oath bound him to serve God faithfully and keep his Word pure, to edify the Church and be subject to the laws and ordinances of the town. A saving clause bore that this last undertaking was not to compromise his duty to God. He, on his part, was to have a liberal stipend (Calvin held that none of the revenue of the old Church ought to be spent on secular purposes, but

this he never secured). He was to be orthodox, biblical, to avoid all papistry, to be diligent in study, to visit the sick, to be liberal to the poor.

The ministers are first of all servants of the divine Word; they conduct the Church services. The ritual will be spoken of afterwards; the greater part of the service consisted of preaching; the phrase for "going to church" was "going to sermon"; each service had a sermon or exposition as its principal element.

There were many sermons, an early one, followed by the principal one at nine o'clock, a catechising for children at midday, an afternoon sermon at three; a prayer-meeting on Tuesday, and other meetings took place on week days. The ministers had to be multiplied. When Calvin arrived there were six city clergy; two years afterwards there were sixteen. But preaching, though the minister derived from it his sacredness and authority, was not his only function. Discipline being regarded as the nerve and substance of Church life, it being impossible to found a real Church life without it, the ministers had to devote much time to carrying it on. A Consistory (*Scottice*, Kirk Session) was formed, and was at work by the end of 1541, consisting of the ministers and twelve elders named by the little Council, who might be re-elected if they proved serviceable. The city was divided into parishes that this oversight might be effective, and two of the Consistory went round the parish with its overseer or minister, that their eye might be on the people, and that they might know who was irregular in attending church and taking the Sacraments, whose children were well brought up, what scandals took place, what papistical or heretical sentiments were uttered. Every house had to be open to them. Irregularity drew down, in the first place, a remonstrance,

and—if this did not avail—was reported to the whole Consistory, which met on Thursday. It had a Syndic of the town for its President (Calvin presided a few times, but was not president), and its officer to summon offenders to its bar. Thus the same persons acted as accusers, witnesses and judges. The examinations were harsh, people were examined as to their religious knowledge, their views and the books they had been reading. The punishments were rebuke, the exaction of penitence in church and of public apology, excommunication; fines also were exacted, and offenders were handed over to the town lieutenant or to the Council. Things we should deem trifling were laid hold of; not only dancing and card-playing, but even the playing of bowls at Easter might lead to the lock-up. Such was the institution which Calvin thought necessary to a true Church, and the severity of which increased with years. There was no appeal, no popular election or control; any book claiming this was suppressed.

The tone of life grew grave and sombre as the new spirit laid hold of each element of the population. Amusements and processions and family festivals ceased; there were no holidays but Sunday, which had to be spent in hearing sermons. Sumptuary regulations were made as to the mode of female hairdressing, the materials and colour of clothes, the number of courses at meals. An attempt was made to replace the restaurants of the town by institutions of a new order, called "abbeys," in which the guests were overlooked by clerical-minded officials, conversation had to be carried on quietly, and no supplies were furnished to those who did not say grace. The names were censored which parents gave their children; no child was to be called Claude or Amadeus, these being the names of local saints, and Calvin was asked to draw up

a list of names which were not to be used. Mordecais, Melchisedeks, Abrahams, Gideons, Zechariahs increased in number.

The Venerable Company also held meetings by themselves, at which discussion of Scripture was engaged in, leading laymen also taking part in it; any matters of interest to the Church were brought forward, warning was given of incipient heresies, and politics too were noticed when the Church was affected by them. These views no doubt tended to knit the preachers together and to develop in them the policy they were willing to support. This meeting reported what was necessary to the congregation or Consistory.

The teacher who comes next to the preacher in the list of offices (I. Corinthians xii. 28) is a clerical personage; the same rules apply to him as to the preacher. The chief end of the school was to educate new ministers, and the Catechism was the principal book used in it. The school had fallen into sad neglect in Calvin's absence, and it was long before it obtained an adequate staff, Cordier refusing to return, and there being few at hand with the gifts required and with the devotion to Calvin which was also necessary. Not till near the end of Calvin's life do we see education brought to a proper state by the foundation of a well-equipped *Gymnasium* and a higher theological school.

The deacons were divided into those who were entrusted with the care of the poor and those who had charge of the hospitals—which were the refuge not of the sick only, but also of the old, of widows and orphans.

Calvin was engaged immediately after the completion of the Church Ordinances, in drawing up a new civil juris-

diction for Geneva, a task for which he was seen by the magistrates to be singularly fitted by his legal training and his talent for administration. He was relieved of part of his spiritual duties that he might be free for this work, and he did it with his might. Every part of the constitution needed revision, and documents exist to this day, marked with Calvin's notes, which show how much care he bestowed on small matters as well as great, on the relation to each other of the different councils, on Court procedure, on the duties of the humblest employees. If the resulting constitution of Geneva is to be regarded as his work—and he was too strong a man not to leave his mark on it with such opportunities—it must be inferred (i) that he was inclined to aristocratic forms of government, since the Council of twenty-five is the real wielder of power in it, the larger bodies of sixty and of two hundred being more rarely called to act; and (ii) that his view of the magistracy as a punishing authority was extremely strict, nay, inhuman. We know from his Commentaries the view he took of the people, that they were naturally evil and inclined to revolt, so that it is the duty of the magistrate to use the sword with which he is equipped, and not to be turned aside by compassion. In the *Institutes* he upheld the death punishment, and he approved of the use of torture as a means of obtaining information. In this he was at the level of his age, but the number of executions and banishments which took place within a few years of the launching of the constitution, even if the cases be subtracted which arose out of the prevalence of plague and the frequent charges which were made of bringing it on by illicit means, shows the spirit of the courts to have been untempered by ordinary mildness.

A few words may be said by way of completing our account of the new Church life of Geneva, about two tasks which Calvin undertook at once on his return, the regulation of Church worship and the drawing up of the second Catechism. The Protestant who witnesses the celebration of the Mass wonders at the multitude of ceremonies, great and small, with which the transaction is invested. Calvin hated the Mass, and often speaks of it in scathing condemnation. He held that nothing should be done in worship that is not directly commanded in God's Word, *i.e.* in the New Testament, since the ceremonies of the law are all abolished. The fewer ceremonies the better, he held; worship was to be as simple as possible. At Strassburg he was in contact with a movement by which the service of Mass was gradually converted into a simple act of Protestant worship; and on returning to Geneva he adopted the worship there in use, due partly to Farel, and added Scriptural prayers of his own. What he then arranged is in use in the Reformed Churches in France and Switzerland to this day, while many of the prayers have been adopted in the liturgies of other countries. His prayers show rare knowledge of Scripture and great literary skill in applying whatever is deep and powerful and moving in Scripture for the expression of religious needs. As we have seen, the service was regarded as a preaching. Calvin had at first, in 1537, expressed the wish that the Lord's Supper should be administered every Sunday, or at least once a month; but the Bern practice was adopted at Geneva, of having it four times a year only, at Christmas, Easter, Pentecost and on a Sunday in September. The Communion table, instead of being in the Choir, where the altar had stood, was immediately under the pulpit. The Apostles' Creed was said at service every Sunday.

The singing of Psalms was a great feature of the service (otherwise than at Zürich, where there was no music at all). Metrical versions of the Psalms were sung, some composed for Calvin by Clement Marot, some by the Reformer himself. A master of singing was appointed by the Council, who, according to Calvin's original proposal, was to teach the children this music, that it might more readily come into general use. There was no music except to accompany words. Baptism and marriage took place in church. In the country districts the churches were kept shut from 1540 onwards, except when the minister came to them to preach; we do not hear of this in the town.

The Catechism of 1541. The Catechism of 1537 was dropped; as we saw, it was not, in point of form, a good educational instrument. A new one was provided to meet the need which was generally expressed, lest, as Calvin says, the old one should be brought forward again. What we have now is really a Catechism like Luther's, which had appeared fourteen years earlier; the children were catechised in it by the minister, and in their answers set forth the whole doctrine of the Reformed Church. It begins as follows,

Minister. What is the chief end of human life?

Child. To know God.

Minister. What is the true and right knowledge of God?

Child. It is where he is so known that the honour may appear which is due to him.

Minister. What is the mode of honouring him aright?

Child. It is when our whole confidence is placed in him: when we seek to serve him in our whole life by

obeying his will, when we call on him in any necessity which arises, seeking in him our salvation and all our good, and lastly, when we acknowledge him with heart and mouth as the source of every good.

Knowing God is immediately afterwards shown to mean knowing him through Jesus Christ. The Catechism passes with halting logic to the Apostles' Creed, which is said to be a summary of the true belief which has always been held in Christendom and to represent the pure doctrine of the Apostles. How the Creed is made to teach the doctrine of the Reformation, in which Christ is regarded more as a Saviour than as the Eternal Son of God, and justification by faith occupies a central position, this is not the place to show. These grave difficulties are rather put aside than met ; it was necessary that the Catechism should teach the orthodox doctrine common to the Church. The only polemics of this part of it are in respect of justification and good works and penitence, good works being shown to be no ground of justification, but the necessary consequence of faith, and penitence being described as entirely a private interior affair, needing no priest or confessor. (Auricular confession was entirely discarded in Calvin's reformation.)

The whole Catechism is divided into fifty-five sections, each for a Sunday. It is to be gone over once a year. Down to the end of the Creed there are twenty-one sections. Two other great Christian documents are also taken up, the law or the ten commandments extending over twelve Sundays, and the Lord's Prayer, the one rule of good prayer, over eleven Sundays. Prayer is not to be offered to angels or saints, no part of our salvation being allotted to them by God. The true spirit of prayer is very

finely set forth; this was a matter in which Calvin was able to speak from abundant experience.

The remaining eleven sections are devoted to the Sacraments; the preaching of the Word is the principal means of Grace, but God makes use of outward means, to which faith and the Spirit are applied, to help the infirmities of his people. There are but two Sacraments. The two last lessons on worthy and unworthy receiving of the Sacraments, concern rather the practice of the Church than the education of children, and might no doubt be omitted. The last section deals with excommunication, and the Catechism ends with the office of the Elders, who were to observe the behaviour of the people with a view to the excommunication of offenders. The children were to know that this was part of the system in which they were being instructed.

Such was the proposed new institution of the Church, the old Church, with all its officials and ritual, having disappeared several years before, and the vacant place not having been properly filled. We are not to think, however, that Calvin had only to suggest in order to have all his proposals accepted or that the success of his proposals was easy and immediate. The Church of Geneva was by no means a theocracy in this sense. The citizens considered their Church to be their own, to rule and to change in whatever way seemed good to them; so it was with the Churches of other Cantons, and so naturally it was with theirs. It was Calvin's aim to have the Church independent of the State, ruled by the Word and Spirit of God which were in her; the State also to be an independent power, supporting and helping the Church while not interfering with her spiritual jurisdiction. But not till after a long struggle

did the Church at Geneva attain practically to such independence. Far from finding himself at the head of a theocracy and having all his behests obeyed, Calvin was, after his return to Geneva, what he had been there before, the servant of the Council; he found great difficulty in getting some of his proposals for the conduct of the Church accepted; he was frequently overruled in matters connected with the services; his learning, his directness of purpose and strength of will gave him much influence, but he had not much power. He was not allowed to revise the corrections made on the draft scheme of the *Ordonnances*. The Elders who were to sit in the Consistory and carry out the administration of discipline were nominated by the Town Council, not by the ministers. In 1542 Calvin requested that a change should be made in the administration of the Sacraments of the Church, and was refused. In 1543 the magistrates were asked to recognise the right of the Consistory to pronounce excommunication from the Lord's Supper, and refused to do so. In 1545 the ministers were censured for removing one of their number from a town to a country charge. There is little evidence in such things of the independence of the Church. Calvin certainly meant that the power of excommunication was to be with the Church, but there was a standing dispute as to this; the clause in the Ordinance was not clear, and it was not till after several years that excommunication was finally decided to be the act not of the Council but of the Consistory.

The detailed proceedings of the Consistory came to light about half a century ago, and may be seen in the *Royale Histoire du Peuple de Genève*, but they do not bear out the old opinion that Calvin was the president of a theocracy, and in this court set himself up as Judge of the

domestic manners of Geneva. The system the Consistory administered was an old one, and common to the Swiss Cantons. The magistracy had long regarded the dress, food and every detail of the private life of the citizens as subject to its inquisition, and the Consistory, though designed by Calvin as a Church Court, was in practice largely of the nature of a State department, the lay members being nominated by the Council and being presided over by a Syndic. If Calvin presided at one meeting, it was exceptional. The ministers no doubt were always present, and had strong influence in the proceedings. But the matters taken up were very small; anything important went to the Council, and the Consistory was left to deal with persons who did not go often enough to hear sermon, or who had exclaimed against the ministers; with quarrelling spouses; with those who gave vent to phrases of the old piety. The examinations were strict and searching; no sympathy was shown for those accused. The cause of good living had to be resolutely upheld, without display of the softer virtues; the whole administration of justice at Geneva was at this time of an unbending sternness, and capital punishments were terribly frequent.

It is not necessary for the purpose of this work to say much about the remaining years of the life of Calvin. By the time of the promulgation of the *Ordonnances* he stands fully grown before us; we know what was his nature and character, what were his ideas of a working Church, and by what machinery he sought to realise them. From this time forward Calvin's life and activity are to be viewed, even more clearly than before, under two aspects. He is to be considered as the city minister fulfilling scrupulously all the duties of his office, preaching, lecturing,

dispensing Sacraments, attending the Consistory on Thursdays and the public meeting of ministers and others for the study of the Word on Fridays; warning, rebuking, comforting; all in obedience to the tradesmen who sat in the little Council and managed the Church as a department of the State. This may be regarded as Calvin's state of humiliation; he never gets the Church as he wants it, nor yet its right of excommunication recognised; his colleagues are not to his liking; there is a party hostile to him and seeking his fall; one disagreeable case after another has to be dealt with, mostly of morals, but there are also conflicts of opinion, accusations of wrong doctrine to be met. On the other hand, we see him in his state of exaltation, acting in his study as the centre of the Protestant cause throughout Europe, writing long letters to the chief men of the day, to reformers, princes and princesses, resolving doubts, counselling in grave difficulties, comforting the persecuted and steeling them to die joyfully for Christ. And besides this strenuous pastoral duty and this massive correspondence, he carries on a busy literary activity; treatises on doctrine, critical attacks on the old religion, sermons and commentaries do not cease to flow from his pen; and he is always at work on his *Institutes*, to prepare a new and more complete edition of that great work. He lived the life of a busy minister, a statesman, and a man of letters all in one, each fully and effectively.

In the chronicles of events, Calvin's life is filled up from his return to Geneva in 1542 with a series of annoying episodes, in the midst of which the claim of the Church for the right of excommunication is persistently advanced, and Calvin grows less and less popular. His influence seemed to be sinking, and his system on the point of collapse when, in the year 1553, the Spaniard Servetus came

to Geneva. The prosecution of Servetus, while it left an indelible stain on the character of Calvin and that of the Church and city which he guided, had the immediate effect of establishing Calvin's position at Geneva on a basis which was not afterwards shaken, but which lasted till his death.

The episode of Servetus sheds so much light on various sides of Calvin's personality and doctrine that we must, even in this short sketch, give it some attention.

Servetus was a Spaniard, born about the same time as Calvin, and was one of those Reformers who desired to carry the Reformation further than Luther did, and to get rid of some of the more difficult doctrines of the old faith which Luther and Calvin retained. He was a versatile man, and published an edition of Ptolemy's Geography, a subject of great interest to that age; an edition of Santes Pagninus's Latin Bible, with notes of his own, showing great learning and freshness of mind, and also works on medicine. His theological works were *De Trinitatis Erroribus* (Errors on the subject of the Trinity), 1531, and *Christianismi Restitutio* (Restoration of Christianity; compare Calvin's title *Institutio Religionis Christianae*), 1553. These two books are based throughout on the authority of Scripture, but get rid of the Church doctrines of the Trinity, of the persons of the Godhead, and of the two natures of Christ. Christ, he held, is never spoken of in Scripture as the Son of God till after his birth as a man. The Pauline doctrines of the Fall, Original Sin, and Justification by Faith are also rejected, and the practice of infant baptism is regarded as altogether wrong, though there is no leaning to the other doctrines of the Anabaptists. In the later book, published three-quarters of a century before Harvey's great discovery, the true view of the circulation of the blood in man is stated, though incompletely.

Servetus sought early to connect himself with the Reformers in Switzerland, but was rebuffed by them. The publication of his first book occasioned so great a scandal that he left Switzerland, changed his name to that of Villanovanus or Villeneuve, and adopted the career of medicine. In 1541 he settled at Vienne in France, where the Archbishop was his friend, and lived there as a medical man. About 1543 he entered into correspondence with Calvin, who kept his letters, and afterwards used them against him. The two men could never agree, and in their letters showed no respect for each other; and Calvin had been attacked before about the Trinity (see above, p. 160). The fact that Servetus felt an attraction to him did not keep Calvin from regarding him from this time forward at least with what appears to have been a deep-seated hostility. He writes to Farel and also to another, that if Servetus came to Geneva, "I should never suffer him to go away alive." In this he talks rather big: he had no such power of life and death at Geneva as the words seem to imply, and it was very unlikely that Servetus would come there; but the words certainly show animosity, and must influence our judgment of what happened afterwards.

Servetus sent the MS. of his new book to Calvin, and never got it back from him; but he had kept a copy. The book was printed at Vienne, with every precaution that the printer's name should not be known, nor the place of printing; but the publication never took place, all the thousand printed copies, with few exceptions, were destroyed by the persecutors. Only two copies of this book are known to exist. Servetus was arrested by the Roman Catholic authorities at Vienne, and it is impossible to doubt that the information on which this was done was supplied by Calvin, though not in his own name. The

letters written by Servetus to Calvin twenty-five years before were produced at the trial. But the trial proved inconclusive, Servetus' escape from prison being connived at by Roman Catholic friends. His fate led him to Geneva, where he was arrested on Calvin's information, and the capital charge of heresy brought against him by a person in Calvin's service. Calvin himself afterwards undertook the office of prosecutor. The details of the trial before the Council at Geneva may be read in vol. viii. of the works of the Reformer, and in the book, *Servetus and Calvin*, by R. Willis, M.D. (1877), there is a full discussion. The trial is dreadful reading,—not so much on account of Servetus, who, after the hopes which Calvin's opponents at first encouraged in him gave way, bore himself nobly and submitted with great courage to his horrible fate; it is Calvin whose conduct it is hard to understand. It is true that he did not pronounce the sentence on Servetus that he was to be burned. The magistrates did that, and refused the milder form of execution Calvin proposed. But the magistrates were necessarily guided in a case of heresy by the opinions of the ministers, the experts in such a question, and of the ministers Calvin was chief and leader. A word from him and the capital charge would have been dropped, his influence could have secured that at Geneva, or in the four neighbouring Cantons which Geneva consulted. That word was never spoken; instead we find him writing to friends in the four Cantons that no leniency was to be shown.

Calvin had himself felt at an earlier stage the difficulties which estranged Servetus from orthodoxy; he had been accused, and might be accused again, of inadequate doctrine on the person of Christ. He could not be expected

to love the person who held up to him full-blown his early difficulties, and in a rude and insulting tone thrust them upon him. Servetus was a difficult person to help; his faults of address and want of temper spoiled his case with everyone. But there can be no doubt that Calvin hated him before the trial began. He went out of his way in bringing about the Roman Catholic trial at Vienne; the arrest and the trial at Geneva were also due to his instigation. It was he who supplied all the documents for the prosecution. It is impossible to excuse the elegant writer of the Address to the King of France prefixed to the *Institutes*, in which the persecutions of Protestants in France are movingly protested at, or the writer of the last book of the *Institutes*, who sets forth the duty of magistrates in dealing with offenders to incline rather to clemency than to severity. The burning of Servetus was keenly denounced even at the time; Calvin himself was uneasy about it, and wrote much to explain and defend the act. The world as a whole has condemned him, and an expiatory monument, erected (in 1903) near the place of the execution, expresses the general sentiment. The last words of Servetus, uttered from the midst of the fire, were "Jesus, Thou Son of the eternal God, have mercy on me!" They sum up his position.

If Calvin showed himself vindictive and cruel to his opponents—and there are other cases besides that of Servetus in which he appears before us in this light—he is not to be judged on the whole by these unworthy outbursts, but by the great work he was doing as the planter and nourisher of a deep and firmly rooted religious life at Geneva and in the world. His dealings with Servetus, strange as it may seem to us, had the effect of making his

position at Geneva more secure and unquestioned than it had ever been before. The other reformers approved of what had been done, as did the neighbouring Cantons; the criticisms which were made were answered and got over for the time. From this point onwards to his death in 1564, Calvin prevailed over his Genevan opponents; in the last ten years of his life he was little opposed, and he saw Geneva such as he desired it to be. The old German opposition died down, largely owing to the continuous and increasing influx of Protestant refugees from France and other lands, many of them men of rank and ability. The right of excommunication was secured to the Church, so that she stood independent in her own place, the State no longer interfering with her discipline. The civil authority was guided in accordance with the views of the Church as the interpreter of the divine Word, so that Geneva came to stand before Europe as a pattern of what a Christian community should be, "the most perfect school of Christ," John Knox says, who had lived there, "that ever was on the earth since the days of the Apostles."

The Academy of Geneva was now called fully into existence, to give a thorough education in languages, logic and rhetoric, its crown being a theological school, in which Calvin himself taught regularly, and which sent forth a thoroughly trained and devoted ministry for the service of the Word in various countries of Europe. Many able young men came from all quarters to study where the purest water of the Word flowed in a constant stream, and as the Reformed Churches looked to Geneva to supply them with efficient pastors, the influence of the school was planted in every land.

This of itself gave Calvin a living connection with the

various branches of the Reformation, and entailed on him a large correspondence. But he stood already in relations with every part of the Reformed cause. He never ceased to be deeply interested in his native country of France and in the work of reform there. He had travelled in Germany, and the German Reformers were his friends and wrote to him. He had connections with Poland, England, Scotland; and his wide correspondence—over four thousand of his letters are extant—shows how widely his advice was sought and what enormous pains he took to supply what was asked of him. His correspondence brings him before us acting as the *generalissimo* of the Reformed cause wherever it had spread; he writes to princes, statesmen, nobles, warriors, divines, and poor struggling persecuted persons, who looked to him as the directing head of the cause and the trusted fountain of sympathy and encouragement in their trials and difficulties. He advised them for the most part to avoid strife, and was always resolute against violence and political intrigue; he pointed out to them the path of duty in the face of a hostile Church and world, forbidding them in any way to compromise their principles, and in the last resort to be prepared for martyrdom, assuring those who were in any such danger that not a drop of their blood would be in vain, and that the glory of God, if they must glorify him in this way, "ought to be much more precious to us than this fading and transitory life." Such deep notes did he touch, so fully conscious was he of what their position required of those who followed him.

Along with constant preaching, lecturing, attendance at Consistory meetings and correspondence, there went a large output of theological literature. Calvin was always publishing Commentaries; we speak of them in another

place. For the most part they were, like those of Origen, the result of his pulpit addresses; and, like that Father, he commented on nearly the whole of Scripture. The successive editions of the *Institutes* also were a labour which continued nearly all his life, till he brought it to the finished form in which we now know it. Add to all this a pretty constant succession of pamphlets, many of them voluminous, on vexed questions of theology. All these labours might have seemed to call for the efforts of several men; and he who accomplished them all—no doubt with the help of several amanuenses—was a weak valetudinarian, who could only eat one meal a day and suffered from distressing maladies.

How great must have been the strength of his will to disregard such formidable difficulties and in so many ways to act upon the world!

II

CALVIN'S TEACHING

I. CALVIN AS A BIBLICAL CRITIC AND INTERPRETER

FROM the man Calvin we turn to his teaching; we have seen what aims he pursued and by what means; we have to ask as to the doctrine he put forward with such confidence as the undoubted truth of God. We shall ask how much of it was inherited from the old Church, and how much arose out of the new situation in which the Reformers found themselves; and as Calvin was one of a number of Reformers, whose teaching was not altogether identical, how much of his teaching is to be regarded as his own.

A few observations on the theological needs of the Reformation may fitly open the discussion. The external event, which more than any other brought about the Reformation, was that revived knowledge of the Bible which was the most precious fruit of the Humanistic movement, and the placing of the Bible, by the new translations and by the invention of printing, in the hands of the laity. The authority of Scripture stood from the first unquestioned, though attempts were very natural, which were made from the side of the Church, to prevent the laity from reading it, and to represent the Latin Bible of

the Church as having more authority than the original Hebrew or Greek.

We give the dates of some of the earliest translations of the New Testament.

French. Le Fèvre, Pauline Epistles, 1512. New Testament, 1523.

English. Tyndale's New Testament, 1525.

French. Olivétan, 1535.

German. Luther, New Testament, 1522; Old Testament, 1534.

Wycliffe's translation into English has the date 1382; but it was not printed till 1850.

The most cursory reading of the Bible showed how immense a difference there was between Christianity as it was at first and ought to be, and the system of rites that was the prevailing religion of that time. The true simple teaching of Christianity no doubt was still there, believed and valued by everyone; but what a mass of later growths now covered it! And those whose eyes were open to this state of things and who gave themselves to put it right, how were they to proceed? Their first task was obviously to direct the attention of the people to the Bible; to read it to them and get them to read it for themselves; to explain it to them and get them to know it thoroughly, and to compare what it said with the existing religion.

This the Reformers did. They took their stand on the Bible, now open to the laity, and gave themselves, with the new learning now at their command, to the work of expounding it. Of each of them we hear what book of Scripture he expounded in his early days; and many commentaries were printed which were the fruit of such exposition. Romans was a favourite book, because it put faith in place of works, a change which the times was loudly

calling for again. Not to mention Le Fèvre, Colet's Lectures on Romans have recently been given us in English. Luther was lecturing on Romans when the Greek Testament of Erasmus appeared, and at once made the Greek text the basis of his lectures; Bullinger of Zürich and Bucer of Strassburg both published commentaries on this Epistle. Calvin lectured on Romans at Strassburg, and published his commentary, the first of the great series, in 1539.

The Gospels also necessarily claimed much attention, for the sake of the contrast between the figure of the Saviour and the actions he did, with those who now spoke in his name. Bucer published a commentary on the first three Gospels, studied together; and Calvin followed him with a work on the same subject.

The work of exposition of the Bible was what the Reformers of necessity first took in hand; but the work which came after it and along with it was no less necessary —that of drawing the teaching of Scripture, as now discovered, into a systematic form, and exhibiting in orderly form the meaning and scope of the whole Reformed movement. Here the Reformers took up the position that though they disapproved of much that went on in the Church, they yet belonged to the Church and were as good Christians as their neighbours. They refused to submit to the authority of the Pope, they disapproved of the pretended miracle of the Mass, and of withholding the cup from the laity, they condemned the worship of images and the selling of indulgences and the enforced celibacy of the clergy; yet they claimed that they were as sound Christians as any, and ought not to be unchurched. They taught the principal articles of the Christian faith; the catechisms they put in the hands of

their people were taken up, like those of the old Church, with the ten commandments, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer; and they held the same views as their neighbours as to the moral and social duties of the Christian life. They practised no secret or illicit rites; they did not aim in any way at the subversion of society as the Anabaptists did. They denied that they were heretics; the Creed was recited at their services, and they believed in the system of thought it represented. They had not left the Church, but continued faithful to the doctrine and the life and the practice the Church upheld. For a generation they clung to the hope, as did the Emperor and the Pope and the Cardinals, that the breach which had taken place in Christendom might be healed, and the nations be embraced again in one religious system. They were ready to discuss matters with the Roman Catholics with a view to this end, and great public discussions did take place about the points of difference. They were not schismatics, but good orthodox Christians; only, with something added to their Christianity which had not been there before, and which they were convinced was the spiritual and dominating part of it, namely, an open Bible, which everyone might read, and in which everyone might acquaint himself with Jesus Christ and the doctrine of the Apostles. And this, too, was no new doctrine; all the early Fathers had regarded Scripture as God's Word, and had taught the duty of reading it.

Among the Roman Catholics also scholarly and reasonable men were busy with the Bible now brought to all men's knowledge, and were writing Scripture commentaries and discussions.

Such was the position in which the Reformers found themselves with regard to the Bible and with regard to

the formation of their new doctrine. We know how in England the reading of the Bible by all and sundry in the latter part of the reign of Henry VIII. led to excitement and disorders, which the government felt it necessary to check by various legislative enactments. On the Continent the same thing took place on a much larger scale in the Anabaptist movement, which spread with great rapidity in many lands from the first quarter of the sixteenth century; it seriously threatened the very basis of society, and acted on the Reformers as a great warning and moderating influence. We are often tempted to wonder that they did not go further and faster than they did in their work of reforming the doctrine of the Church; but it was a necessity of their position that they should maintain an orthodox attitude and should carefully guard their movement, as Calvin does in the letter to the King of France, which he placed before his *Institutes*, against being in any way identified with teaching which led to social disorder.

We speak of the part taken by Calvin in the great work of explaining the Bible done in the sixteenth century. He wrote commentaries which occupy forty-five volumes in the Edition of the Calvin Translation Society. No one would in this day undertake to publish commentaries both on books of the Old Testament and books of the New, but in the early Church many did so, from Origen downwards, and we shall see later how the principles Calvin held and the manner in which his expositions were produced made it natural that he should do so. In point of knowledge of the original languages he was well equipped. He had seized every opportunity that presented itself in his youth of learning Greek. There was no Greek to be had at Paris in his undergraduate days; but at Orleans,

and later at Paris when the King instituted his Royal lecturers, and later still at Basel, he applied himself to Greek study. And there was a lecturer in Hebrew at Paris as also at Basel. The King's lecturers at Paris were meant to give an impulse to classical studies, and that Calvin shared the spirit of that movement is proved by his edition of Seneca's *De Clementia*, which he wrote before he heard the call to the service of religion. That commentary shows a wide knowledge of the literature of classical antiquity and a happy turn for grave argument on questions of practice and morals; the writer of it undoubtedly possessed important acquirements fitting him to deal with Scripture when the time came. It is not given to us to see Calvin at the time when he first became acquainted with the Bible and felt its power to enlighten man's path. He is studiously silent about his youth and early manhood, and we are left to the scanty statements of contemporaries about him and disputed inferences from his own words. We may be certain, however, that a serious young scholar, who read and mastered all the Greek and Latin books he could lay his hands on, would not be ignorant of the Greek Testament, published in 1516, when he was seven years old. He could not have Greek enough to read it till 1530; but when he left France he undoubtedly knew it well, and a year or two before that time he would form the judgments, which meet us frequently in his expositions, that the language is not polished, but rough, and in many places slipshod and incorrect. We find him learned in Greek grammar, and a master of its technical terms. He points out when a participle is used for an indicative or imperative; when a sentence is incomplete; when the end of a sentence does not properly complete its beginning. Questions of textual criticism do not escape

him ; though few different readings were then known, he presents us with one now and then, and he frequently corrects the version of Erasmus, sometimes with good reason, sometimes with little reason. The literary scholar and the dogmatic writer were naturally often at variance. But Calvin is often more than a mere dogmatician, and there is always some literary quality about his expositions, such as was sadly lacking to the lesser men who came after him. His doctrine of inspiration is not so high and narrow as in the later divines ; he has sympathy with the authors of Scripture, and enters into the position in which they produced their work, and he is also conscious of their limitations. It is always the sense of a passage that he looks for, and especially its bearing on human conduct and what is to be found in it to encourage and console. In this he is typical of the Reformers generally, who felt too deeply the needs of the Church, the desires of the flock for nourishment and protection, to waste their time over ingenuities, or, as was done in last generation, to bedizen the texts of Scripture with ornaments of learning. Believing that God was speaking in every part of Scripture to human souls, and that the salvation of men depended on their hearing and understanding what God said, and on applying it to their own case, they found their task an earnest and solemn one, on which nothing trivial and nothing extravagant could be suffered to intrude.

But Calvin is not merely one of a class of men of whom this is to be said. He has a method of his own with Scripture, and connects it with a system of Christian doctrine which some of his brother Reformers were far from sharing. Let us ask about the method he applies to the exposition of Scripture. It is brought before us with perfect clearness in the Preface to the second edition of his

Institutes, published at Strassburg in 1539. In the title to this edition he claims that it has now been brought to correspond with its title, *Institutio Christianae Religionis*.

The first edition was much shorter, and was constructed on the plan of the early Protestant Catechisms, treating of the Decalogue, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, and then of matters more distinctive of the new doctrine; it also had been called the Catechism.

In the second edition, of which we are speaking, that order was thrown aside, and instead there was given a much longer and more logical statement of the whole Christian doctrine, as Calvin conceived it. In the preface to this second edition he says that his object in this work was to prepare and train students of theology for the study of the Sacred Volume, so that they might have an easy introduction to it and be able to proceed in it with unfaltering step. Those who are rightly acquainted with the *Institutes*, he says, will be able to ascertain without difficulty what they ought principally to look for in Scripture, and to what head they ought to refer, whatever is contained in it. "Having thus as it were prepared the way," he goes on, "I shall not feel it necessary in any commentaries on Scripture which I may afterwards publish to enter into long discussions of doctrine. In this way the pious reader will be saved much trouble and weariness, provided he comes furnished with a knowledge of the present work as an essential prerequisite."

When Calvin accordingly comes to write Scripture commentaries he will have with him ready-made the key to the meaning of Scripture; what that key opens will be accepted as the real genuine truth of Scripture; should things be found in it which do not answer to the key he has provided, they will be set aside as unimportant, or

some plan will be found to dispose of them. Scripture is to be interpreted in such a way as to yield his system of doctrine as its outcome. We are reminded of the famous passages in Tertullian where the *regula fidei*, the norm of true doctrine, is not Scripture but the Creed of the Church, handed down by all the principal Churches in harmony and held to be the standard to which all interpretation of Scripture must conform. If that is so, then Scripture is reduced to a secondary position; exegesis cannot be free, but must be carried on under the supervision of the Church and made to support the Church's doctrine. If the reader is to read Calvin's *Institutes* first and take from them his notion of what he is to find in the Bible, then the Bible is not allowed to speak freely; it is determined beforehand that we are to find in it the doctrine of the Protestant Reformers and no other.

It is very extraordinary to find a young man of thirty taking up this position. (He was only twenty-six when his *Institutes* were first published.) "You are to take my *Institutes* with you," he says to the student of theology, "and to learn from them what doctrine Scripture contains." That was the boldest of all the bold steps the French Reformer took. He saw that it would never do to have everyone at liberty to read the Bible for himself and to come to his own conclusions as to what it said.

But, on the other hand, the circumstances no doubt called for such a step. If Protestantism was to succeed, it was necessary that it should have a standard in addition to the Bible, which might act as a flag and combine all its various forces. In our day we hold that the study of Scripture ought to be free and open, and that the best way to steady opinion on the subject is that men should be placed in the Universities, bound by great traditions which

make all University study deliberate and cautious, and bound by their responsibility to the Christian public ; also that these men should state their own conclusions to their students and to the world. That ideal would scarcely have been suitable in Reformation times. If Protestantism had not shown that it was orthodox, it must soon, in that age, have broken up and gone to pieces. It was necessary that it should couple with its deference to the Bible as the supreme authority a statement of the truth which it considered to issue from the Bible, and according to which the Bible was to be read. It was Calvin's great work to supply to French Protestantism the creed which it required, and to have done this so decisively, so quickly, so well.

It is true he was still young in years when the *Institutes* were first published, but Luther had gone before him, and Calvin had done ten times the work of the average student of his years. The faults of youth appear in his work, but not very pronouncedly. He is somewhat over-confident, he has a lawyerlike tone, and an insulting epithet is always ready for any views different from his own. That was Calvin.

When we read the Commentaries, however, we find that they do not go so far as we should expect in the direction of forcing Scripture to conform with Calvin's system. He is a great man and his views are wide, and he has a great knowledge of literature. He has a happy insight into the nature of the book he takes up, and his tendency to edification keeps him free on the whole from exaggerations and absurdities. He declines in some instances to accept the plain meaning of a passage which will not fit into his system, but that is rare. He does not go into long digressions ; his motto as an interpreter is "lucid brevity."

There is one of Calvin's doctrines which we should

expect to influence his exegesis, his doctrine of Scripture. The view he takes of the character and inspiration of the Bible must necessarily tell on his mode of dealing with the books. When the question is asked, near the beginning of the *Institutes*, How do we know that the Bible is God's Word, what is the evidence that it comes from him? Calvin naturally declines to base Scripture on the authority of the Church, which he holds to be human and fallible. We know, he says, that the Bible is God's Word, because we feel it to be so, when we come to it with a pious mind. The Spirit which spoke to the Apostles and Prophets and inspired them to write, speaks to us also in a convincing way ; when we read their writings we feel that what Scripture says is true and comes from God. His phrase is that Scripture is *αὐτόπιστος*, self-evidencing ; it carries its proof in itself. That is undoubtedly true. The grave and earnest simplicity of the Bible must impress everyone who opens his mind to it ; and when we regard the Bible as the record of the revelation God has made about himself and the true way of serving him, it cannot be but that the statements of Scripture as to the nature of religion will come powerfully home to us, and we shall see its writers to stand in a living relation to the source of all truth and to have a message to ourselves as well as to their own age. The doctrine of Calvin corresponds to what Christians generally feel about their Scriptures, and he does not weaken it by over-definition. He took no part in the controversies raised by Luther about some of the Bible books which he felt to be on a lower level than the great principal books. He did not comment on the Song of Songs, but neither did he on the Proverbs, though he often quotes them, nor on the Apocalypse. He might have done so had he lived longer. He does not, when

discussing the doctrine of Scripture, give a canon or a list of the books to which the doctrine is to apply; he accepts, without saying so, the books of the Vulgate, which was the Bible of the Church of his day, less those books which were not received by the Synagogue, not having been written in Hebrew, and which we call the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. He wrote and lectured on all the books which stand in our New Testament, except the Apocalypse.

I will not dwell much on Calvin's work on the Old Testament, which is less my province. He is best, I think, on the Psalms, being deeply in sympathy with the religious spirit which is found in them, so direct, so simple, so pure and unworldly; here he reveals himself at his best, as a man truly religious and capable of expressing religious sentiment in a genuinely human way.

Some of his commentaries were written and published by himself, *e.g.* Romans (1540) and Joshua (1562). Others consist of the notes of his hearers; two of them took down all they could, and afterwards compared their notes and made as complete a version as possible of what the master had said; or, the two sets of notes were submitted to a third person, who undertook the labour of making a good text out of them. The result was afterwards submitted to Calvin himself, who then made his corrections and issued the book with a dedication to some French prince or some great scholar. In his later years he was so much engrossed in affairs that he had not much time to prepare his lectures on Scripture and could not write them out; these reported lectures are generally rougher and shorter than the exegesis he himself prepared for the press.

In the commentaries on the Prophets each day's portion

is accompanied by a prayer; many of these prayers are fine, and general enough in sentiment to bear being used at this day. The commentary on Joshua was the last Calvin himself wrote. He feels the difficulty of treating Joshua as a Christian book, and writes at great length about the sending of the spies and the falsehood by which their escape from Jericho was shielded; to the effect, broadly, that the Church, being guided and inspired by God, is not to be judged by human standards, which no doubt condemn lying and fraud. The slaughter of the inhabitants of Jericho, it is said, might seem an inhuman massacre had it not been executed by the command of God.

On Psalm 101, the Mirror of Magistrates, he teaches very strongly that it is the duty of the civil magistrate to use the sword with which he is entrusted by God for the repression of whatever is likely to prove mischievous to the commonwealth, and especially to guard the Church from defilement. He must not yield to weak human motives, because God likes not the cruel kindness which gives loose reins to the wicked. That was written after the death of Servetus.

The commentaries on the New Testament also were produced in the course of the work of edification—which at every period of his ministerial career was Calvin's most regular and principal employment. Very little space is given in them to questions of Biblical Criticism, such as the authorship of the books and their date and immediate occasion. The immediate occasion is to him a matter of small moment; the real and substantial occasion of the books still exists in fact, it is to be found in the needs of Christian people at the present day, in their sorrows and

calamities and dangers, their tendency to grow slack and to forget and fall away, their need of warning and threatening, of comfort and encouragement, and of exhortation to kind and brotherly living. Calvin never writes a page of commentary in which the position and needs of the Church are not close to his mind. Every sentence is addressed by God to the faithful as they now are. What does God wish us to gather from it, how are we to receive it so as to be sure that the Word is suited to our need, and precious? That is the question he puts to himself in each verse and clause. And so the questions of Biblical Criticism scarcely exist for him. Not that he is not very acute in grasping the position of a book. Mark, he sees, is not, as Augustine declared, *pedisequus Matthaei*, the close follower of Matthew, because his order is often different and many of the stories are much longer in him than in Matthew. The three synoptic writers are all independent of each other; each was inspired and had enough material of his own to go upon, even had he derived no matter at all from elsewhere. The Spirit is seen here and there to have neglected the order of the time, when the sequence is not the same in the three. The discussions of the sayings of Christ and of their changed meanings in the different contexts in which they appear in the three Gospels are very acute and correct, even by a modern standard. Doctrine does look through now and then, where the scholarship of to-day sees none; as where Jesus is said to have gone to the Mount of Olives on the last night of his life, not to hide, since Judas knew the place, but to offer himself willingly to the fate the Father had fixed for him, since his death could not have had the required virtue had it not been undertaken willingly. The scene in Gethsemane is similarly interpreted. Christ feared death because he was

bearing our sins and was face to face with God's incomprehensible judgment. The interpretation of the rending of the veil at the crucifixion is characteristic. That the veil was rent means that the ceremonies were abolished by which God was formerly approached. He is now approached, not through a priest performing Mass, but directly by the individual himself who has faith in him through Christ.

It is in his commentary on Romans, the first which he published, that we see Calvin most in sympathy with his author and most eagerly supporting and enlarging him. Romans, as we saw, was a favourite work with all the Reformers; it set forth the doctrine of the situation in which they themselves were; a spiritual faith bursting through the barriers and wrappings of an effete material religion and calling all men to live by faith and to assert their freedom. Once or twice, even here, Calvin does refuse to allow Paul to say what he undeniably does say; *e.g.* iii. 24, the death of Christ a sacrifice with reference to sins of the past: viii. 30, "whom he did predestinate," interpreted of the sorrows and afflictions which are the appointed lot of believers. But on the whole the Commentary on Romans is a fine and understanding work, and most so in the most spiritual passages, chapters v. and viii.

We do not on this occasion go further into detail. We have seen the main principles which Calvin's interpretations followed. He knew in advance what was to be looked for in Scripture. God, he says, had shone upon him with his Word, and the views suggested to him by that early reading of Scripture were in his eyes, ever after, the essence of Scripture. He built up these views into a system and put

it in the hands of divinity students to be used as the key of Scripture with which in their hands they would know in advance what they were to look for in the Bible. Not everyone could find the truth of Scripture, but only those whom the Spirit enlightened who inspired the sacred writers at first. The treasure must be approached with a pious and believing heart else it would not be won. By his learning and his eminent good sense and strong desire to be of service to the Church, Calvin was enabled to avoid grave errors and to discharge in an effective way his life's work of making the Bible a living book to his generation. The work he did was done so well that it lasted for centuries, and determined up to our own day the sense which was to be extracted from the Bible.

The views of Calvin belong now, in one way, to the past. We may still admire the learning of the scholar and the grave determination of the divine which enabled him to serve his time so well. But no one will now prepare himself for studying the Bible by studying first the *Institutes* of Calvin. The key he provided has come to the end of its usefulness. We no longer think of placing our theological system in that position of a key to Scripture. We consider it dishonouring to Scripture to require it to conform to any creed. We see that the Bible must be allowed to speak for itself, with the aid of all the knowledge the centuries have brought of those ancient worlds to which its writers belonged. The study of Scripture demands in our day a very different preparation from that of Calvin. If he came to his task master of the learning of his day, so must we, so far as our strength allows. The student of the Old Testament must be acquainted with the lore of Babylon and with the study of comparative religion. The student of the New must be equipped with the know-

ledge of the life and thought of the Roman Empire, a knowledge which has in these last days been so enormously deepened and extended. To do our duty by the Bible, we must arm ourselves with weapons which were not dreamt of in the days of Calvin. The study of the text of the New Testament, the knowledge of the common speech the writers of the New Testament employed, the knowledge of Greek and Roman religion, the philosophy of the Empire, the intermingling of East and West, the clash of ideas from every direction, all this has to be apprehended if we are to do justice to the Bible.

What Calvin may well teach us still is that we must not lose ourselves to such an extent in this sea of various learning, that the direct, grave, and simple teaching of the Bible shall escape us. We may well read his commentaries for the edification they are so full of and learn from him how to apply to common needs the reproof and instruction and comfort which after all are the soul of the Bible. He would be a poor preacher who read nothing but Calvin, for the truths which edify quickly grow trite and commonplace and lose their power if they are not related to the living stream of learning. But he would be a poor preacher too who dealt so much in the new learning that he forgot the words spoken of old to Abraham and David and Isaiah, which are as true and as effective now as they ever were. The great proof that we understand the Bible must be that we feel its authority over our own life and submit ourselves willingly to its teaching.

II. CALVIN AS A THEOLOGIAN: THE "INSTITUTES"

The book known as Calvin's *Institutes* was first published in 1536, and somewhat hurriedly. It was meant originally to be a manual of religious instruction for

beginners, but the course of events in France caused it to be transformed into an apology, showing the king of France and others what was the nature of the new doctrine. After the two years which followed, crowded with journeys, with vicissitudes and anxieties, and having—one would suppose—little opportunity for serious literary application, a second edition appeared at Strassburg in 1539. It now truly answered to its title, *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* The title of the French translation, published in 1541, adds the words, "in which is contained a summary of piety and, as it were, all that is necessary to be known in the doctrine of salvation." First the book is a summary of piety, then of doctrine.

Instead of the six chapters of the first edition, the book now has seventeen, and is a key to open to all the children of God a right and direct understanding of sacred Scripture. If Calvin should have to write commentaries afterwards, he will not have to make long digressions since he has here set down at length all the articles which belong to Christianity. He excuses the delay in the appearance of this edition, because "for two years God has exercised him in a strange manner." The second edition is much longer than the first, many new discussions appearing in it, and the order being much changed and the whole book recast. The French translation of 1541 marks an epoch in the history of the French language; the work of Calvin in giving the French people a Christian doctrine in their own tongue may be compared with that of Luther in giving the Germans their Bible.

A third edition of the Latin *Institutes* was printed at Geneva in 1559, after a number of reprints of the second edition in which revision did not fail. The revision of

1550 divided the book into chapters and paragraphs, of which there are in all 1217. The edition of 1559 has a new title, "Institutions of the Christian Religion, newly arranged in four books and divided into chapters in proper order and method, also augmented by such an increase of matter that it may almost be regarded as a new book." In the year 1560 a new French translation appeared, from the hand of the author, with many alterations. It is the Latin of 1559 that is now accepted as the standard edition of the work and is in all lands.

The *Institutes* is a monument of theology which answers to its title. Contemporaries called it a catechism, and the first four chapters are of that nature. But the wonderful thing about it is that while he continued to labour at the book all his life, the original draft underwent no important change. The man of twenty-seven is able to put forth the system of Reformed doctrine which is hailed by the Protestant world as an adequate statement, and in which the repeated examination of the older man introduced no radical change. This is an extraordinary achievement. To state the faith of a community is never an easy thing, and the belief of the French Protestants amounted for the most part to a positive belief that the Bible was the true source of doctrine, plus negative suggestions which had come from Germany—"no indulgences, no images, no celibacy of the clergy, no purgatory." To give them a creed which should hold them together, to assure them that they were Christians, that, though they had parted with much, they had kept everything essential, to enable them to face the world and win others—this was a great work, especially when we consider the grave questions, like freewill and fore-ordination, which had yet to be settled within Protestantism itself.

Many difficulties were escaped by the simple form of the first edition. It moved round great documents which enjoyed an undisputed authority with Protestant and Catholic alike. The first chapter on the law is occupied with the Decalogue; the second on Faith, with the Apostles' Creed; the third on Prayer, with the Lord's Prayer; the fourth, with the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The fifth is more polemical, on the false Sacraments. The sixth is taken up with Christian liberty, the power of the Church and the power of the State. In the Epistle to the King of France he says that he had meant to write some rudiments, and in the Epistle to the Reader it is said that the book is meant as a kind of Introduction to Scripture, and the reader of Scripture is recommended to read this book first; then he will be prepared and will know much more readily where he is when he takes up the Bible. In the Commentaries which Calvin has it in his mind to write he will refer to this book. He takes for granted—all the Reformers did—his right to fashion a key for the Bible and to recommend the people to read the Bible as he wished them to understand it.

What is the origin of the System of Doctrine which fills the pages of the *Institutes* and is found in many a Catechism and Confession of later date? What are the sources of the doctrine and how much of it is of Calvin's own devising? When and how did it all come into his head? Obviously a book of this size cannot be expected to answer these questions at all fully, and can only point out the directions in which the answers to them are to be looked for. A full statement of the question would require wider knowledge than any one man can be expected to possess. But Calvin himself is very full of references

to his authorities, and it is easy to collect the names of those he refers to. Cop's Address, which, if Calvin wrote it, is his first Protestant work, names no authorities, but is found on close examination to be based on statements drawn from Erasmus and from Luther, and to Luther Calvin frequently appeals (though not in the *Institutes*) as the beginner of the Reformation movement, whose work he was carrying on. The Church Father he quotes most is Augustine; he always agrees with him, and the debt of Protestantism to Augustine is not to be measured. The German Reformers are fully aware that it is the doctrine of Augustine that they are recommending; and Calvin, especially on the deeper doctrines, the doctrine of God, of Sin, of the Divine foreknowledge and fore-ordination, has Augustine constantly beside him and quotes him at great length. But he quotes all the Latin Fathers, and of the Greek Fathers, the early ones, Justin, Irenaeus and, though rarely, Origen; of the later ones, he is fond of Chrysostom and Basil.

Calvin kept up his reading on the Fathers, and knew the editions which were published of them; he remembers what he reads of them and is ready with quotations. With the Schoolmen he is also familiar, as his education at Paris would lead us to expect, but from them he got less for his purposes. We come to the Bible, the book for which the *Institutes* were meant to be a guide, which was newly placed before the French-speaking world by Le Fèvre and Olivetan, and is quoted frequently on every page. We must speak later of what he taught the Bible to be, and of its supreme authority; here we consider the Bible as in part the origin of Calvin's doctrine, as one of the factors which combined to make him what he was as a teacher of doctrine to the French people. But the subject, we feel,

is hidden from us. We are not allowed to look into Calvin's mind and to see how the Bible first began to affect him, how its authority grew greater and greater to him, and at last carried him entirely away from his allegiance to the system in which he was brought up and which he had served till then with obstinate faithfulness. In his reply to Cardinal Sadoleto's letter he places in the mouth of the Protestant defending himself at God's bar a statement of the mode in which the new doctrine had prevailed with him; but this is concerned with confessions and works and the worship of Saints, and scarcely teaches us how the Bible acquired its position of tremendous authority to his mind. To judge from that statement, if it is to be taken as personal to Calvin himself, it was the downfall of the authority of the Pope, to his mind, that left room for the coming of the higher authority of the Bible. But we see from many other passages that it was the way of peace found in the Bible that most of all attracted him to it. He had a sense of sin in his Roman Catholic days, and eagerly sought for forgiveness without finding it. There are expressions here and there in his writings which point to an experience not only of intellectual doubt but of great anguish of heart because of God's wrath with him. It was the discovery that God forgives in Jesus Christ the soul that turns to him in faith, without any sacrifice, that won him to the Bible and induced him to search it further. We cannot doubt that it was by a truly religious and not an ecclesiastical motive that Calvin was won for the Bible; he found in it a way of salvation free from all that was doubtful and questionable in the old system, with no compromises or weak accommodations in it, worthy of spiritual beings, of God on the one hand, of man on the other, and dealing in purely spiritual values. Both in the

Old Testament and in the New he heard the voice of pure religion, in which God does freely all he can for man, and man gives himself to God without measure or calculation, and his mind was soon made up that the Book which gave him this was true, was God's Word for him, and that he was called to preach that Word to others and to live and die for it. It was thus, I conceive, that the conviction that the Bible is God's Word, God's Word to every man, first broke through for him in vivid experience, and while, as we shall see, he was led to certain exaggerations in this matter, and with other Reformers gave occasion to a doctrine of Scripture which was anything but a blessing to the Church, it was by a deeply religious view of Scripture that he arrived at his authority to be a teacher to men of the Divine counsel.

Of his use of Scripture we speak later. We merely remark here that he possessed a very comprehensive and thorough knowledge of the Bible, such as was possible in that age, and must have applied himself with great intensity to obtain the mastery of it which he possessed.

We remark further that he is indebted to earlier Reformers, not only to Erasmus and Luther, but also to Bucer, whose moderate and unassuming mode of thought was well fitted to lay hold of him ; who was afterwards to bring him to Strassburg and whose commentaries on the Gospels he can be shown to have used.

Of the style of his treatment of doctrine we may say that it is distinguished not less by decision and clearness than by moderation and good sense. The position he had taken up as the writer of the first exposition of French Protestantism and as the writer of the first Protestant Apology involved both that he had a distinct message to set forth and that he avoided extremes, placing the

doctrine in a light to commend it in the eyes of the world. The spokesman of French Protestantism, which was persecuted for excesses it did not commit and regarded as licentious and dangerous, had to take up the ground that the new doctrine was really the old, only purged of abuses which had grown round it in dark centuries; that it preached a doctrine which not only was that of the Bible, but also that of the Church Fathers, and that it maintained the truth of the Church creed and the practice of the early Christian centuries.

The fate of the Anabaptists, preaching wild doctrines, dangerous to society as well as to the Church, and disappearing in a few decennia, shows what must have happened to Protestantism if it could have been said that it had parted with the ancient doctrine of the creeds and that its doctrine of liberty was subversive of civil order. Calvin could not have stood forth as a champion of the new cause had he not been able to present the doctrine in a moderate and reasonable form, which showed him to stand on the old ground and to be not merely bent on casting down images and changing religious practices, but to have a body of truth to set forth—for the body he felt to be the true Church—which could brace the world and claim the assent of reasonable men. Like the other Reformers, he is a teacher of positive truth, not of paradoxes or vague mysteries. And his teaching is extremely practical and always aims at edification. No doctrine is set forth that he does not feel to be valuable to religion, to be comfortable as well as reasonable, to carry with it the assurance of God's mercy as well as to be true in itself. Even those parts of his teaching which appear to be repellent and exposed to every criticism for exhibiting God's dealings as capricious and unfeeling, are advanced because of the

religious comfort which they bear to those who are able to accept them. He writes as one offering the new doctrine to the world as a reasonable thing, but also as one placed in the position of a guide and shepherd of humble souls and seeking to lead them to green pastures. The doctrine he sought and believed he had found was first of all a nourishing, substantial one, not speculative or theoretical.

Calvin attacks his subject at once without any preliminary matter. The Bible has come in the place of history for him ; he does not attach himself to any philosophy ; he engages in no argument at the beginning of his work to prove the existence of God, nor does he discuss what God is in himself, in his essence ; he opens his book not with any systematic view of God, but with the statement that the whole sum of our wisdom consists of two parts, the knowledge of God and of ourselves. He tells us in a tone of peremptory authority that we can only know ourselves by considering God at the same time, and that we know him by contrast with ourselves. All that we have is not from ourselves but from God ; the ruin into which the fall of the first man plunged us compels us to look up to ask what we need, poor and hungry creatures as we are, and awakened by fear to learn humility. The writer takes up his stand at once on the doctrine of the fall and the corruption of human nature. All the Reformers did so ; they could not have come forward as expounders of Scripture without doing so ; and the only way to get rid of all the easy mechanical methods of dealing with sin which the old system offered was to assert, as Augustine did, the total depravity of human nature and the need of a more radical cure for it than any confession and penance and absolution could supply. We can regard

ourselves as good only when we compare ourselves with our fellow-men ; when we look to God we see at once that we are vile ; and the horror and fright into which the Old Testament worthies fell, who thought they had seen God, are taken as proof of this.

Then follows a chapter, one of the most interesting in the book, on what we nowadays call Natural Religion, the knowledge of God that is open to men from what they see around them, the knowledge we should have of him, if Adam had not fallen. Here too, however, Calvin is practical not speculative. He keeps at a distance from himself the discussion of what God is in himself ; it is how we are to feel and act towards God that is considered ; there is no true knowledge of God apart from religion and piety. The fact that we are in his world and are the creatures of his hand gives him authority over us. We cannot yield ourselves to the thought of God without feeling that we owe everything to him ; that he is worthy of entire trust ; that he is our Lord, our Father ; that he is the avenger of all wrong ; that it is our place to fear and reverence him, and to render him the worship which our hearts tell us is his due. This knowledge of God is natural to all men ; religion is not the invention of priests seeking to subject men to themselves by fear. Idolatry proves that men have a feeling of God ; that they ever must worship something ; there is no escape, in the denial of him, from the consciousness of his authority. The philosophers have taught this ; all men alike are aware of it. It is a truth not reserved for the wise ; the simplest when they look up to the splendid spectacle of the stars at night, when they consider the wonders that are comprised in the human body, must confess the wisdom and care of the Creator and be filled with the conviction of his glory. The wicked

have this knowledge of God as well as the good, but they would fain cast it away and escape from him. An emergency will call them back to appeal to him of whom they pretended to be ignorant.

We are here in presence of the root thought of Calvin's theology, and before going on to consider the manner in which it is worked out in his doctrine of Providence, we may dwell for a moment on the thought itself. The sections of his work in which he speaks of God are written under some glow of feeling, though the effect is marred, to the modern reader, by the bitter and contemptuous tone adopted to all who may show by word or action that they differ from him. It is the natural heart that speaks in the first instance of the wonders of the creation and of the instinctive rising of the soul towards God; it is the trained disputant and lawyer who supplies many of the phrases. There is real feeling in some of the expressions about the beauty of the world and the suggestion of God it makes to the unspoiled mind. It is not the argument from design which was the outcome of the deistic controversy of the eighteenth century that we find here, so much as the more aesthetic and spiritual view found in Scripture and the Fathers on the one hand, and on the other hand, in Wordsworth. The contemplation of the growth of one blade of grass, it is said, tends to lift the mind up to God. But it is by the contrast of God with ourselves that we receive the strongest impression of him. When we contemplate the great power that is around us in the world, we become conscious of our own littleness, weakness, and imperfection; God grows more and more, and the soul which can only conceive that she has any goodness and merit of her own when she compares herself with other

human beings, is stripped of all the merits and ornaments she was disposed to boast of and sinks into nothingness. Yet one need never feel quite forsaken or in despair, since the contemplation of the world shows it to be the creation of one good and merciful as well as just, and to be the work of love and kindness. We are therefore encouraged to hope all things from God, and to put our trust in him for all that may befall us, assured that he will never fail us.

The reader of Augustine is reminded of him even when Calvin does not mention that great writer. Passages are not wanting in Calvin where the personal appeals of the soul aspiring to God, which are so arresting in Augustine's writings, are again met with. His definition of piety, that it consists in reverence and love of God for all the good things he has done for us, and his statement that when we regard God as our Maker and allow that idea freely to work on our mind, God grows more and more to us while we sink into insignificance—this was no new teaching to his day ; it is the teaching of Augustine and of the mystics ; it is the doctrine both of the Old and of the New Testament, both of the Psalms and of the Sermon on the Mount. The Revival of it by the Reformers showed that religion was awakening in Europe, that faith was finding its true object and learning to express itself in its true language. Calvin declares at the beginning of his Catechism that the chief end of human life is to know God, because he has created us and placed us in the world that he may be glorified in us, and that the true knowledge of God is that which leads us to honour him. This is the keynote of Calvinism ; it is the doctrine which places man in the position of absolute subordination to God, and teaches him to recognise, first of all, God's sovereignty

and supreme authority, since we owe everything to him and owe him everything.

Calvin is led to defend his doctrine of God from various misinterpretations to which it was exposed. It was not a doctrine of immanence, of Pantheism; Nature may be said to be God, he says, if it is a pious man who says so; but God is always above and behind Nature, and can act in other ways than those of Nature if he chooses to do so. Against Deism he is very decided; he has nothing to say to a God who creates the world and then leaves it alone.

This brings us to his doctrine of Providence, which, as everyone knows, is one of the most strongly marked of his doctrines; it is that from which his doctrines of Election and Freewill, to which such vehement objections are entertained, are logically derived. In what he has to say of Providence, Calvin no longer deals, as in his teaching of God the Creator, with things recognised and willingly accepted by all minds of normal constitution, but with a view of the connection of events with each other and with the divine purpose, which cannot be proved and which the ordinary man is probably inclined to deny. In his chapter on Providence (i. 16) Calvin puts forth what appears to be an unnecessarily extreme form of the theory that God's Providence extends to everything that happens, even to all the actions of men. Against what he tells us was the general belief in his day, viz., that things happen fortuitously, he maintains that the work of creation finds its natural continuation in the work of Divine Providence, that "the Creator is also a Governor and Preserver, and that not by producing a kind of general motion in the machine of the world as well as in each of its parts, but by a special providence sustaining, cherishing, superintending all the things he has made, to the very minutest, even to a

sparrow." He presides over each year, each month, each day ; as Scripture teaches in many a passage, he is everywhere, and does whatever he will ; his omnipotence is efficacious, energetic, ever-active, and nothing happens that he has not knowingly and willingly decreed. He not only gives an impulse to the globe and decrees that in each department things should take place in a certain regular way ; each shower is an evidence of his favour. Does a branch falling from a tree kill a passing traveller? It is he who has delivered the traveller to that death. Calvin pleads here strongly that Christian people ought not to speak of Fortune as doing this or that, but should say, "So God pleased."

Calvin takes great pains to show that none of the objections which were urged against this doctrine in his day, as they are urged in ours, have any real force, and that the doctrine is in the highest degree consistent with piety. If everything that takes place does so by the mysterious and irrevocable decree of God, then why should anyone be blamed for his misconduct or carelessness, why should we seek to guide affairs to one issue rather than another, why guard against danger? We cannot go into these tangled arguments with which everyone is familiar. The doctrine is upheld in spite of all objections, and is enforced by the dicta of Scripture as to the mysterious and incomprehensible nature of God's dealings. But we are not to impute caprice to God, as if he used us as playthings ; rather are we to assure ourselves that he has good reason for all he does, however little we may understand it, and in due time we shall see that it is so. We are not to demand his reasons, but to exercise ourselves in modesty and acquiesce in the divine decrees. To him who piously

receives the doctrine of divine providence there comes great peace and the assurance, even in the darkest hours, that everything is being well ordered by the Supreme Ruler. He knows that God is everywhere at work, and is assured that that work will be his safety.[1]

If God gives us so clear and full a knowledge of himself by his outward works, may we not be content with that knowledge which he gives us? We know from the world in which he placed us that he is the Creator of heaven and earth, that he preserves and sustains us, and rules all things in heaven and earth for the benefit of his children, then what need is there for revelation? Calvin is ready for this suggestion, and meets it in two ways: (i) The knowledge God has given us of himself is not sufficient for our wants, since we require a God who is not only a Creator and Governor of the world, but who is also a redeemer from sin. During the whole of his exposition of Natural Religion he has this point in view. That might have been our religion, he implies, had Adam not fallen; as it is, a different religion is necessary for us. But (ii) man has so obscured and spoiled that knowledge of himself which God gave him in his works that little of it is now seen, and man is practically destitute of the knowledge of his Maker. For these two reasons a revelation is necessary, which shall give us a knowledge of God which we can definitely trust. Oracles no longer arrive on the earth from heaven, and revelation must be supplied to us in writing; God adds to the knowledge of himself given us in Nature, the light of his Word. Thus we are introduced to the Doctrine of Scripture. First we have a comprehensive estimate of the existing religious condition of the world, and then a dis-

[1] See Doumergue, ii. 419.

cussion of Scripture and of the evidence that in the Bible God has actually made known to us his will.

Calvin's estimate of the condition of the world in respect of religion is as different as possible from the opening chapter of a modern history of religion. He was without any of the preparatory studies which have made it possible for the present generation to gather up into one view all the religions of the world and to regard them as all alike pertaining to the religion of the world. His information was no doubt on a level with all that could be known of the subject in his day, but in the absence of a comprehensive ethnology, which was not possible in the sixteenth century, in the absence of information about ancient Babylonia, about China, about the life and the beliefs of savage tribes,—to mention only these helps to the study of religion,—no adequate view of the subject was at all obtainable. What was known of Greece and Rome was calculated to inspire respect rather for the philosophy than for the working religion of antiquity. Most of all, the guiding principle was wanting which in our day makes the study of religion fruitful. The principle of development in human affairs, the notion of a divine education of the human race, was not even to be dreamed of till two centuries after Calvin. He had to look on the world of human opinion and practice, as it then presented itself to his eye, and, convinced that he himself possessed the truth, newly discovered to man's spirit, to frame such a judgment of it as was possible. No wonder that his judgment was a sweeping condemnation; that he saw in the world of human religion, a "vast welter of errors," a great widespread universal defection of the human mind from truth. He adopted the verdict of the Apostle Paul, that the heathen are without God, each nation having its own view

of God, nay, each individual. There is no need, he says, to make a catalogue of all the superstitions in which the world is involved—there would be no end to it; from such a number of corruptions it appears how horrible is the blindness of the human mind. The philosophers, too, were all at variance; even Plato, the soberest and most religious of them all, loses himself completely, and the differences of the philosophers led to the denial of all the Gods and the despairing worship of an unknown God.

Another and a better help must therefore be given us than the light of Nature, which has been misread so fatally, and the shining of which leaves us without excuse. God chose the Jews to be the depositories of his truth and communicated his will to Abraham and the Patriarchs; he finally committed his holy truth to perpetual memory in writing. The Bible contains his revelation of himself, and is to be accepted by the faithful as if the living utterances of God himself were to be heard in it. It is not the Church that gives the Bible its authority; it would be putting our faith too much in fallible men to think so. It is to be accepted for its own sake.

Here we should expect that Calvin would at least give a catalogue of the books which are to be recognised as belonging to Scripture, that he should give some indication of the way they came to be written and of the process by which they have been preserved, that he should give some indication whether it is enough to read the Bible in a translation, or whether the Hebrew and Greek originals should be used where possible. None of these questions, however, is entered on where the doctrine of Scripture is put before us. What books belonged to the Bible was no doubt known to all. The Vulgate was the Bible; it was to be seen in many a church, in every monastery. No

doubt it contained some books which were never accepted by the Synagogue as belonging to the Jewish Scriptures: the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach, the books of Maccabees and others. Calvin does not often quote these books, and he recognises that they have less authority. But in putting Scripture in its place in his system of doctrine he thinks it necessary to refer to that. Nor does he refer to the invention of printing or to the fact that the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures had been recently put in type; nor to the translations, those of Le Fèvre and of Olivetan into French, that of Luther into German. How are we to account for all this reticence? Was it due to modesty, to the wish to avoid display?

No doubt he does not wish to interrupt the argument by attending to matters of interest mainly to the learned. That God has added to the revelation of himself in Nature this revelation in words which is now alone to be considered, that is the point he is driving at; and he presses forward that the reader may feel the weight of that thought. The Bible is to be accepted as if God himself were heard uttering the words of it. To Calvin himself no doubt the Bible had come just with that directness and authority, bidding him give up his Roman Catholic superstitions, cut himself off from the old Church and regard himself as a sinner whom God had chosen to do a work for him; and he will have others see and feel in the Bible what he had seen and heard. He puts it forth as a doctrine, undeniable and true for all men, that God spoke these words, and will have us to take this Book as coming straight from him.

What proof is offered that this is the character of the Bible? What answer is to be made to those who deny it? —and such there were in Calvin's day, as in ours. When

we are pressed with the question, How do you know that the Bible has been handed down safe and entire to this age, that this book in it is to be reverently accepted, and that one put out of the Canon? and if the authority of the Church is to be declined as merely human and unequal to the weight of such a conclusion, how is the authority of Scripture to be proved?—to this the reply is that as the prophets did not spend labour in proving that God gave them their message but simply declared, "Thus saith the Lord," so it is with Scripture. The attentive reader finds that he is confronted with things rather than words; the absence of rhetoric is made up for by the force of the matter. A point which modern discoveries would not allow is made of the antiquity of Scripture; there is no written document of any religion, it is asserted, that is not much posterior to the age of Moses. Egyptian chronology, which goes back 6000 years before the creation of the world, receives of course no credence. But Calvin is in no need of testimonies to the divine authority of Scripture. Scripture is to him its own authority, it is αὐτόπιστος; it carries its evidence in itself; there can be no evidence more cogent than that of God who speaks in it. Those whom the Spirit teaches are firmly convinced that Scripture is God's Word. The Spirit which spoke through the prophets makes us independent of other arguments when it shines upon our hearts and makes us feel that in Scripture God is addressing us. When we attain to this conviction then we find abundance of outward arguments to confirm it; the nobility of the matter, the consistency throughout, the graces of style, the antiquity, the miracles, the prophecies, the care taken by God for the perservation of his Word, even the testimony of the Church is not without its weight. But only when our certainty is based on the inner

persuasion of the Holy Spirit does Scripture suffice to give us a saving knowledge of God. This is a thing within the power of anyone, even the swineherd's answer to Sadoleto's letter may claim that God has thus spoken to him in Scripture, that he is thus set free from the shackles of the Church in which he was formerly held and brought under the authority of God himself. The religion of the Psalmists and Isaiah and Paul and John has opened its doors by the rediscovery of Scripture, to take in whoever will turn to it in faith.

III

THE INFLUENCE OF CALVIN

We are prepared to hear that Calvin's work survived him. His *Institutes* could not disappear at his death; they formed by far the most complete statement of the doctrine of the Reformation, and met in a wonderful way the interest everywhere diffused in the newly-discovered Bible. They placed a complete new religion in the place of the old one, with a confidence and mastery of every part of the field, with which Lutheranism had nothing to compare. If the Roman Catholic Church had ceased to furnish to the human spirit the guidance and assurance it craved, and if the Word of God himself was to be looked to as the source of all religious knowledge and the sole guide to pious living, how was the new position to be understood? What was the teaching of the Bible? What system of belief did it put in place of the old doctrine? What was its central principle? How could it be shown to supply a complete philosophy of man's trust and hope in God? And, in particular, what kind of Church was to come in place of the old one? What office-bearers was it to have, what were to be its rites, by what rules was it to be secured against individual caprice and to prove a solid and permanent shelter for believers? To all these questions there is no doubt that the *Institutes* of Calvin gave more complete and substantial satis-

faction than any other book or manual of that age; more thoroughly reasoned and compact. Protestants could point to it with pride, and could see in it the creed of their religion. Not much creed-making was done or was needed by the early Calvinists; they found in this book, which was soon translated into the principal languages of Europe, a full statement of what they believed and what their religion required of them.

In this way Calvin's work survived him; it also survived him in the Church which he had founded at Geneva and left with full and efficient educational equipment, to a large extent if not completely clothed with the powers he had sought for it, backed by a magistracy who no longer opposed its aims, and surrounded by a population on the whole willing to be governed as a people of God. Geneva was the centre to which all the Reformed Churches looked for guidance and direction and example in the life according to the Gospel, and this continued under Beza, Calvin's like-minded successor, and long after him, to be the case.

Calvin's work survived him also in the numerous pupils he trained and who were sought as teachers in every land where his teaching took root and in the Churches of many countries, Churches founded by his counsel and with which he carried on an active correspondence. We have now to look at the countries in which Churches were founded under his influence, to notice the varied circumstances of their inception and growth and the marked features of their history. It may be said at the outset that the development of Calvinistic Churches was from the first markedly different from that of the Lutheran Churches. The latter were as a rule state Churches, each under the patronage of a Duke or Landgraf, depending very much on his favour, owing to him not only their original consti-

tution, but practical protection and guidance. Henry VIII. of England shared the view of the Lutheran princes and their peoples that, the old system of a religious uniformity under the Papacy having broken down, it belonged to each people with their sovereign to fix what should be the religion of their land, a theory which prevented the Lutheran Churches from coming to form a united system, and which was in many ways a source of weakness. The Reformed Churches were, at least at first, not formed in this way by the acts of governments; they were more independent of their several states and relied more upon their own inner forces. They were endowed from the outset with a vigorous constitution, which enabled them to govern themselves, and in some cases, as in France and in Scotland, to draw to themselves many of the functions of civil government and to appear as a state within a state. The Calvinistic Church was a body of persons who regarded themselves as elect, and felt themselves to be called to regulate their own affairs, and not only this, but to extend their influence in the land where it was placed. And in many cases the constitution of the Church, derived direct from God and imposing on its members a higher allegiance than that to their King, enabled them to do this. Such a theory led to a different development of Church life in different countries. But Geneva was a little place, and admitted of only one Presbytery or *Vénérable Compagnie*, adjusting its affairs with the government of its own town. When Calvin died the adjustment was fairly complete; the civil government had been brought to concede to the Church the right for which it had long striven, of excommunication. The arrangement proved permanent; we hear no more of conflict between the Church and the civil power.

In France, as the numbers of the Reformed grew great, it was necessary to extend the constitution of the Church. Calvin watched assiduously over the growth of the movement in his own country; we saw how he encouraged its martyrs, and he was much applied to for directions by its struggling young churches. He discouraged the formation of churches before they could be fully equipped on the model of Geneva; but he urged the believers to hold together and be ready for their opportunities. He was against all violent courses and conspiracies. A constant supply of young preachers trained under Calvin was sent to the French pastorate, and they carried with them the practices of the Geneva Church, using Calvin's liturgy, which is still in use in the French Reformed Churches. In so large a country it became necessary to organise the clergy after a new model. Adjacent churches were formed into a "colloquy"; and the colloquies of a district into a provincial synod; while a national synod, in which they could all be represented, secured their unity. This system was adopted by the Church of Scotland in its Presbyteries, Synods and General Assembly; it was transferred to America, and is characteristic of the Presbyterian Churches generally. In France first was this system fully formed, and there it proved equal to the task of consolidating the form of the Reformed Church and enabling it to stand against the unsympathetic and hostile State.

The Gallican Confession was drafted by Calvin and enlarged by his pupil Chandieu; it is a faithful summary of the doctrine of Calvin, drawn up in forty sections. It was adopted by the Synod at Paris in 1559, and presented to Francis II. at Amboise in 1560, and also to Charles IX. in 1561. It was formally ratified as the Confession of the French Church at the National Synod at La Rochelle in

1571, and held its place for three centuries. After a generation full of persecution and tragic suffering, the Edict of Nantes in 1598 secured the toleration of French Protestantism. The revocation of that Edict in 1685 drove many of the flower of the French nation across the seas. But our limits do not allow us to dwell on this. (In 1872 the Reformed Church in France took up the task of forming a new statement of its belief. In this document, which is very brief, loyalty is declared to Holy Scripture, to the older Confession and to the Apostles' Creed, as well as to the person of "Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God.")

Nor can we enter, as we should wish, into the subject of the influence of Calvinism in the Low Countries. The Reformation there was originally Lutheran; but persecution drove it here as elsewhere to assume the darker robes of Calvinism. The revolt against Rome was also a political revolution against Philip; and those who led the revolution to a successful issue prevented the Dutch Church from any extreme form of ecclesiastical rule and made Holland a land of religious liberty more than any other in Europe. In Belgium, which remained Catholic, the Calvinistic northern provinces found also a great hindrance.

[At this point the notes are mainly jottings upon the toleration movement under William of Orange—

William of Orange was a Calvinist. The Belgian Confession dates from 1561 and the *Discipline Ecclésiastique* from 1564. Toleration for Protestantism in Holland was achieved in 1609, and the Synod of Dort in 1618 was very important for the history of Calvinism.

Refugees of various kinds came to Holland, as well as

many Jews from Spain. The large views prevailing there may be connected with the Calvinistic teaching of the nature of the world and the movements which go on in it. The value of learning came to be appreciated; Leyden asked for a University and Holland produced great men of science. In spite of the influence of Calvinism, there was no general Church constitution in Holland; this was tried at Dort, but the attempt was a failure. And the Calvinistic Church of Holland had no connection with the art of that country, and was indeed far removed from it.

Is there any connection between the Calvinism of Holland and the eminence of that country in the pursuit of science? Dr. Kuyper, who is a Dutchman and ought to be able to judge, is very decided on this point. It is certainly the case that in Calvinism, where all things are from God and to him, wide views of the origin and sequence of things might well prevail, and that the toleration of the princes, who shared the faith of their people without narrowness, might well encourage research and learning. In England the age of scientific enquiry springs up after religious passion has sunk to rest at the close of the Commonwealth; and so in Holland too, the country which had abjured religious passion sufficiently to provide a refuge to Descartes and Spinoza.]

In England also the Reformation began with Lutheran teaching, along with the translation of the Bible into the common tongue; but travel, especially the travel of men going into exile for their faith, soon set up the same conflict of Protestant opinions in England that had prevailed in Switzerland and Germany; the more thorough Calvinistic doctrine was vigorously pushed and gained the upper hand in England as in Scotland, though in the former country it

was afterwards modified. Calvin himself was in active correspondence during this time with the heads of the English Church. He wrote frequently, at Cranmer's suggestion, to King Edward, as well as to Cranmer himself and to Somerset the Protector. He did not need to take any special steps to bring his views into notice in England; they were well known already to theologians, and his *Institutes* had been adopted as the text-book in theology at Oxford and Cambridge.

The *Prayer Books of Edward VI.* mark a critical point in the march of the English Reformation. They were pushed forward under the direction of Archbishop Cranmer, rather in advance of public opinion. The first to appear was an English *Order of the Communion*, which was to be used for the Mass, and is, in fact, called by that name. It is in the English language, and the cup is given in it to the laity. Much is said of the awfulness of the mystery present in the Sacrament and of the danger of unworthy taking; but all is made to depend on the faith of the individual communicant. In the first *Prayer Book of Edward*, which was printed in the same year, the Communion Service is longer, and contains an admonition to those who are so inclined to come to private confession before partaking, but the doctrine is the same, not committing the Church to any of the theories of the Eucharist held on the Continent, but exhibiting the rite as a source of infinite comfort and assurance to poor sinners. Thus the place of the laity in the Church is recognised; what is done is done with them and by them; they are called up, it has been picturesquely said, into the chancel.

A work of revision, however, was at once called for; various objections were taken to the book; the clergy were in general content with it, but a number of refugees

had arrived in England from the Continent whom it did not satisfy ; they had brought with them a simpler ritual, more in the spirit of Calvinism. The sermons of John Knox, at this time one of the Court preachers, also made powerfully for revision.

The second Prayer Book of 1552 does not differ markedly from the first. The vestments of celebrating priests were simplified. The formula of exorcism was removed from the baptism service ; the communion was no longer to be received kneeling. The invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the elements was discontinued, and the prayer of oblation was changed into a thanksgiving ; and the words used in delivering the elements were, instead of the old form, " The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee," which may be taken to express the Zwinglian position. This last change, as well as most of the others, was afterwards withdrawn. The second *Prayer Book of Edward* is the high-water mark of the influence of Swiss teaching in the dealings with the Liturgy of the Church. The Ordination Service was not changed in 1552. The nature and office of the clergy is plainly expressed as that of ministers of the Word ; the candidate is to declare that the Holy Scripture contains sufficiently all doctrine required for salvation, and is to minister the doctrine, the Sacraments and the discipline of Christ as the Lord has commanded. The name of priest is retained, but the functions are not those of a priest but of a minister of the Word. So plainly is the mark of Geneva impressed on the Anglican Liturgy. In the Articles also we find its mark. They were published in 1553, numbering originally forty-two, though from the time of Elizabeth thirty-nine

is the number of them. The model which they followed was the Augsburg Confession of 1530, which was drawn up by Melanchthon, with the assistance of Luther, and still is the principal creed of the Lutheran Churches. They were the work mainly of Cranmer, and are written with the rare moderation and dignity characteristic of their prototype. The Article on the Lord's Supper (now No. xxviii.) does not set forth Lutheran but rather Calvinistic doctrine, which Cranmer is known from his writings to have held. The Lutheran belief in the real presence of Christ in the elements is abjured ; the body of the Saviour is eaten only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, the mean by which this is done being Faith. In other Articles, also, Calvinistic teaching is plainly traceable, as in that (xviii.) on Predestination and Election (though reprobation is not spoken of) and that on the Church (xix.). In the Article (xx.) on the authority of the Church there is no mention of Episcopacy nor disapproval of Presbytery ; according to Calvin's known sentiments, the form of Church government is not a thing to be dogmatically fixed.

The Marian persecution, sending many devoted Protestants to the Continent, produced effects which may be compared to those of the Babylonian captivity of the Jews. Religious debate, stifled in England, was carried on abroad with undiminished zeal ; and as many of the exiles were men who afterwards became leaders in the Church of England, their experiences in foreign countries came to be of great importance. The notorious troubles at Frankfort arose out of the conflict between the exiles who aimed at a thoroughly pure ritual and took objection to the Prayer-Book as conceding too much to the old superstitions, and those who wished the services carried on exactly as they

were accustomed to them in England. The Puritans—the name occurs from this time forward in English history—were forced to leave Frankfort, and, with Knox as their pastor, settled at Geneva, where Calvin was at this time at the height of his influence. Englishmen could not carry on their religious life at Geneva without considering the Church discipline which obtained there; if the doctrine of Calvin was accepted, why not also the discipline, which was part of the doctrine, and that part which gave it its solidity and its power to act and to defend itself in the face of the world?

In France the Presbyterian Church government had been adopted, and had proved a great success. There was a great disposition at this time to look with favour on the system of government of the Church by Elders and Sessions. The Articles do not pronounce upon the matter, but leave it open to the Church (Art. xx.) to adopt any form of authority that can be shown to be Scriptural. The doctrine of Episcopal Succession belongs to a later time; it was Laud who introduced it in Britain, and as the English Church did not dogmatically affirm Episcopacy, Calvin did not discountenance that system where circumstances had established it and called for its continuance.

There was much in that age to favour the rise of Presbytery. If the Reformation had brought to the peoples which adopted it the sense that they had attained their majority in spiritual things, and that the Church was something more than a system of priests, that it was (as Article xix. declares) "a congregation of faithful men," then a popular form of Church government must have seemed to be called for, in which the faithful man would come to have his proper influence. And this such a system as that of Geneva appeared fitted to bring about. It was far from

being entirely democratic. It was a system, an orderly constitution—not like the practice of the Anabaptists, against which all the regular Churches were so jealously upon their guard, a state of things in which a majority could do anything it liked, without any guarantee for order and consistency—but a system in which the laity counted for something; elected their ministers and their elders; had access to the courts in which ministers and elders met to lay before them their grievances and requests. With the growth of the Calvinistic doctrine of the Church as consisting not of the clergy only but of believing men, each called by God and responsible to him, this view of Church government could not but increase.

In the Scottish Reformation, of which we shall speak ere long, Presbyterian Church government was at once set up; no less could be expected in a movement headed by Knox; but in England Presbyterianism was always obnoxious to the King or Queen, who was the head of the Church of England and leant on the assistance of the Bishops. But in England Presbyterianism also had many friends, though it was only in the days of the weakness of the monarchy under Charles I. that they brought the country to their side. Under Elizabeth the Prayer-Book and the Articles were set up again, with modification of their more decidedly Protestant features, and the Protestant tone of the country generally was much lowered. The contentions of Cartwright, Professor of Divinity at Oxford, that Episcopacy was altogether wrong and ought to yield to Presbytery, and his setting up a specimen of Presbyterianism at Warwick, were soon suppressed; and it was shown decidedly that the Church government of Geneva was, at that time at least, to have no place in England. A constant criticism of the Liturgy and the Articles was

carried on by the Puritans; but on the other side Calvinism no longer appeared to the nation so attractive; it wore a face more stern and forbidding, and by the end of Elizabeth's reign theologians of a new stamp were coming forward in the Church of England, who were less encumbered with foreign ties and thought their own Church and its formularies well worth defending. James on his accession acted as Head of the Church, and found the courtly Bishops a very pleasant change from the harsh and outspoken Presbyterians he had encountered in Scotland. . . .

IV

THE PERMANENT MESSAGE OF CALVINISM

WHAT is the substance of Calvinism for the present day? Much that we meet with both in the life and in the doctrine of Calvin is of no practical interest for the modern world, but belongs to a distant country and a remote period of time. It would be a poor thing to boast of the change which Biblical Criticism has made since Calvin's day in our views of the Bible. Our view of the Papacy is also much changed; our view of the importance of doctrine, as compared with other elements of the religious life, is also very different.

Yet, after all necessary deductions have been made, it will be found that much of the original doctrine of the Swiss Reformers still survives, and that there is a stately sisterhood of Churches at this day, which, while holding their minds open to all the progress of the present century, still do not refuse to be called Calvinistic, but rather insist on that title. Their roots are in the rich soil of the development of Calvinistic doctrine; their views of God, of man, and of the world are broadly those of the Reformation as it came forward in Switzerland, in Holland, and in Scotland; their mode of worship, though this is now threatened with change, is that which is dictated by the austere Reformed doctrine, their protest is still awake against all that called forth the protest of the Reformation.

They have welcomed, more or less cordially, both the processes and the results of Biblical Criticism, the humane spirit of a new age has estranged them from the harshness and rigidity of the old Church discipline, they feel the revival of architecture and the beauty of the old prayers and of the lives of the Saints, and yet they know that the reason of their existence has not passed away. They cannot return to the old Church, whatever its stateliness and charm; they must still protest against the errors of that Church wherever they appear. They still have a testimony to uphold, a message to deliver.

We shall endeavour in this chapter to define the principles of Calvinism as these are now held by the enlightened and progressive Churches of the Reformation. This has often been done. It has been done by Dr. A. Kuyper in his Six Stone Lectures, delivered at Princeton, New Jersey, in October, 1898, in which the claim for Calvinism is set forth perhaps in a way to provoke opposition. It was done by the late Professor W. Hastie in his Croall Lectures (1892, published in 1904) with great mastery of the history of Protestant doctrine, and in a just and moderate spirit. [At this point Dr. Menzies intended to mention Troeltsch, but his notes upon that theologian's view of Protestantism are not in existence.] The attempt now made must be on a smaller scale, and with less learning than any of these.

The root of the Reformation theology is to be found in its doctrine of God. The Lutheran doctrine has a different starting point; it begins with considering man, a poor lost creature, sorely in need of forgiveness and justification, and makes the doctrine of justification by faith its principal article, the cornerstone on which all the rest is built. It is true in this to the experience out of which it

had its rise, as Luther in his convent struggled and agonised to reach the assurance of his personal salvation. Calvin also taught this doctrine, but he did not place it, as Luther did, in the front of his teaching. What stands first with him is what stands first in the Bible, what forms the opening of the Ten Commandments, of the Creed, of the Lord's Prayer; the thought of God as the Creator and Ruler of all things, and of the absolute claim he has to the reverence and obedience of his creatures. Calvin appeals, as the Scriptures do (it is vain to quote passages for this; it runs all through the Bible; but see Psalms viii., xix., xxiv.; Isaiah xl.; Amos, etc.), to the magnificent spectacle with which a human being is confronted in this world, and asks us to consider what the natural heart must think of all the encircling splendours and beauties, and of the Being who has made them all; he takes it for granted, as the Prophets and Apostles do, that there is such a Being, and that he is to be known by man. Must not the natural heart judge that man stands in a personal relation to the Maker of the earth and sky, and has been called to acknowledge and obey him?

The claim which God has a right to put forward on man thus meets us from the outset of our existence as we come into a world which has been in every way prepared and furnished for us, in which all our wants are met, in which our minds meet with a thousand interests of every kind. As the Psalm puts it, "It is he that has made us and his we are; we are the sheep of his pasture, the flock of his hand." On this the Psalm builds the further claim that we should worship the being who has made us and provided for us since ever we came into existence. We ought to recognise it as the first of all our duties to give thanks to him and bless his name, to bring to him the homage of

our worship and veneration, coming to his courts with thanksgiving, entering his gates with praise. This argument, that it is right and necessary for us to yield to the claim made on us by the Author and Ruler of the Universe, meets us again and again in the Old Testament and also in the Gospels and Epistles, in the Sermon on the Mount, in Paul's speeches at Lystra and at Athens, and not less clearly and powerfully in the Apocalypse. The doctrine of the Reformed Churches is based on it. No doubt is made but that, having once discovered our relation to God as dwellers in his world and made by his hand, a permanent obligation rests on us to cultivate the most intimate communion with him and refer to him every matter both of our outer and of our inner life. This point deserves to be noted as an example, no doubt the principal one, of the Reformed doctrine resting content with no half measures, but proceeding at once, on a truth of the religious life coming into view, to the extreme consequences it seems to ask for. God might be recognised as our Creator and Preserver, and yet we might shrink from living too near to him and so admitting him as a witness of every care, every temptation by which we are visited, and every doubt that enters our mind. In the Reformed doctrine no half measures are allowed. God once recognised in his true relation to us, we are called to play our part in that relation to the utmost, to confide in him entirely, to have no secrets from him nor keep back any sacrifice or exertion for him that is in our power.

This doctrine of the claim God has a right to put forward on man meets us at the outset of Calvin's *Institutes*, and it does not fail to meet us in the various Catechisms and Confessions of the Reformed Churches. The Shorter Catechism of Westminster opens with the question, What

is the chief end of man? to which the answer is, Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever. So true is it that the Reformed doctrine begins with God, bringing us face to face with him, insisting that we owe all to him, and that we are bound to recognise his sovereign authority and to serve and obey him with all our powers. This is one of the sources of the tremendous influence the doctrine wields, especially over strong natures. They feel that the doctrine is not playing with them nor flattering them, not speaking half truths to them, but that it represents to them the full truth of their position in this world, and leaves it to them to choose their part in it.

The God with whom men are thus brought in contact is no product of speculation nor of poetic imagination, nor is he a construction of mysticism. He is a very real being; only, in the reign of the Old Church he had been lost sight of and hidden behind the crowd of lesser heavenly beings and removed to a distance by the apparatus of Church machinery. It is just the God of the Old and New Testaments revealed afresh by the new knowledge of the Bible which has come to pass, and entering on his rule as the centre and head of all religion, with the same vigour and immediacy as of old. He speaks and commands with the old authority; he denounces judgment on his adversaries; he defends and comforts his own people, and promises them eternal happiness with himself, just as in the Old Testament. He alone does everything that is done in the world, and the acts he does are prepared long ago, even from eternity. His decrees are fixed and cannot fail nor be defeated.

This doctrine of the sovereignty of God is to be regarded as the great contribution of Calvin to the religion

of his time and the succeeding centuries. All the other parts of his teaching flow from it; what is to be thought of our fellowmen, what is to be thought of the world, how the believer should bear himself in the changing fortunes of his life, all is built up on this centre. Here most of all we see the character of the Reformation he brought about, and are able to judge of the motives which led him to it. We see his action to have all the character of greatness, simplicity, directness, intense truthfulness, unflinching courage. It was just what his age required; it was at once hailed as bearing to the world the message that was needed; and it has stood the test of time. Confronting man with his Maker and bidding him live in the closest intimacy with him, the doctrine of the Divine Sovereignty lifted religion to its highest level, out of the confusion and degradation which had settled upon it, and made it direct, simple, spiritual, and ennobling.

This was an act worthy of a great scholar, who was also a genius in religion and a true friend of mankind. The world can never cease to be grateful to him for it.

PART III

COLLECTED WRITINGS

I

THE CALL OF THE CHURCH TO THE NATIONS[1]

Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye lands (Heb. *all the earth*)
Serve the Lord with gladness:
Come before his presence with singing.
Know ye that the Lord he is God:
It is he that hath made us and we are his; (another reading is, *and not we ourselves*)
We are his people and the sheep of his pasture.
Enter into his gates with thanksgiving, (or, *a thank offering*)
And into his courts with praise:
Give thanks unto him and bless his name.
For the Lord is good; his mercy endureth forever;
And his faithfulness unto all generations.

THIS Psalm is sung at every missionary meeting. Those who use it in this way can not be expected to think much of the position of the original writer of it, or of the position of the people in whose name he spoke. It is a challenge, an invitation to all the lands. What did those who first sang it in the worship of the temple know about

[1] This paper appeared in the *Constructive Quarterly* of December, 1915, and is reprinted by kind permission of the Editor.

the lands? What did they know about the religion of the lands? Other questions also arise before us about this Psalm. On what ground did the Jewish community of the temple venture to ask the lands to sympathise with them in their religion and even to take part in its rites? And what response did the invitation meet with, at the time or later?

When the Psalm was written, the Jews must already have known a great deal about the nations surrounding them and about their various religions. The precise date of the Psalm can not be fixed, but the thoughts it expresses show it to belong to a somewhat late period of Jewish history. It claims that Jehovah is the Maker of all men and that He means well by all men alike, that He is constantly doing them good, that He wishes them to recognise Him as the source of good and to take part in the worship which ascends to Him. These thoughts do not belong to an early period in the mental history of the Jews; there will be general agreement that they belong to an age after the great prophets, they are based upon the great argument of the prophets, that Jehovah is above all the gods of the nations, nay, that He alone is God, and that He is the Creator of the ends of the earth and of all those that dwell in it. These great conclusions are all embodied in our Psalm, which sets them forth in popular rhythmical form, in solemn simplicity, for great acts of national worship. By the time when the Jews reached these conclusions they knew a great deal about the nations of the world and about the religions they carried on. They knew about the Babylonians and their star-worship, for they had dwelt in Babylonia; they knew about the Egyptians and their worship of animals, for there was a Jewish temple high up the Nile; they knew about the

Greeks and their gods made in the likeness of the human figure. All this they knew, and they had been led to the conclusion that their own religion was far better than any of these and was destined to prevail over them all. The believers in all those deities might therefore well be asked to recognise Jehovah as supreme over them all and to take their place by the side of His people, entering into His gates, standing in His courts. The Jews had risen to the conception of a world-wide religion and here they issue their bold invitation to all lands to come and take part in it.

The religion in which all the lands are summoned to take part is described, it is true, in the most favourable light, its harsher aspects are not dwelt upon. If a Babylonian or a Greek attracted by the summons made enquiry as to the terms on which he could be received as a worshipper of Jehovah, he would find some conditions in his way which were calculated somewhat to repel him. He must become a Jew; in order to obtain the whole of the promised blessing he must identify himself in a distasteful observance with the small people in a corner of the world. He must submit to the yoke of the law. He must close his place of business every Saturday. He must restrict his diet to foods the law accounted clean, giving up pork and oysters and many another delicacy. He must go to Jerusalem on pilgrimage, and arrived there, must take part in the killing and offering of a sheep or other victim. He must subscribe regularly to the keeping up of the Temple service and priesthood.

Of all this the hundredth Psalm says not a word.[1] It overlooks all those material considerations and speaks only

[1] The marginal reading *v.* 4, is rejected by Bäthgen; as is the interpretation in this sense of the title.

of God, how good He is, how generous, how entirely to be depended on; and of man, how entirely he is God's creature, how deeply he is in debt to God for everything, how natural it is therefore that he should recognise the debt he owes, by praising God and worshipping Him. With regard to God, all men are in the same position; Jew and Gentile are alike His creatures and dependent on Him for everything; and there rises before the eyes of the Psalmist, not only in the hundredth, but in many another Psalm, the noble vision of a worship in which the whole world will join, a universal religion which will be recognised and welcomed by all nations, in which men of every race will gladly flock together to take their part.

What answer did the great invitation meet with? To judge from the Gospels, the Jews themselves had by the time of Christ to a large degree gone back from it, and had come to think more of their superiority to other nations and of the necessity of keeping apart from them, than of any great acts of worship in which Jew and Gentile alike could join. The Temple, which was to be a house of prayer for all nations, was so no longer. The court in which the Gentiles were to pray was used for other purposes. Jew would not eat with Gentile nor come into contact with him when it could be avoided; the Gentiles were sinners in his eyes; they were dogs; they were to have no part in the Kingdom to which he looked forward. The efforts the Jews made to bring the Gentiles into their religion were very half-hearted and very unsuccessful. This declension from the generous anticipations of the past, deplorable as it was, was very intelligible when we remember how the Jews and their religion had been treated in the interval,—the Syrian King Antiochus attempting by force to make the people abandon their religion and grossly

insulting it, and the Romans, who deprived them of their political liberty, treading that religion under their feet on various occasions.

But in the Acts we find a different state of things. Wherever Paul goes in the Mediterranean lands, he finds a body of Gentiles attending the Jewish Synagogue, attached to the worship of God which was carried on there. It was the same in every land. Thoughtful Gentiles, many of them people of wealth and influence, had come to see that the Jewish religion offered them what their soul was seeking, a pure and noble faith in an unseen God who was righteous and merciful, a faith reaching far into the past and holding out rich promise for the future. In the Jewish religion duty was made plain, which to Greek philosophy was surrounded by manifold doubts and difficulties; the God who had given the Ten Commandments was undoubtedly a righteous and holy God, who cared both for individual men and for human society, and the long history throughout which He had in many a telling instance rewarded the righteous and punished the evil-doer and been faithful to His ancient promises, encouraged the heart to trust Him and seek His favour. In the provinces the Jews were less averse to contact with their Gentile neighbours, than was the case in Palestine; and so it came about that in the Greek cities of the Empire there was a large response to the invitation made to the Gentiles in the hundredth Psalm and other Psalms, to join the worship of Israel. It was among these "God-fearers" and proselytes and honourable women that Christianity was most readily accepted and that the ideal of our Psalm, of a worship of God in which both Jew and Gentile should join, came to be realised.

That is an interesting piece of history, perhaps more

than a piece of history only. Some dreams pass for a moment over the mind of a community and are then no more thought of; but there are dreams which refuse to be forgotten, they cling to men's minds. Out of the dream a hope is born which grows stronger and stronger till in the course of time it matures into a living reality. The dream, the hope, of the hundredth Psalm is of this better kind. Once expressed it could not be left behind; when circumstances favoured, it was found that the community of the Jews had attracted to itself great multitudes of Greeks and other foreigners and that the praise of God went up from every corner of the inhabited world, from men of every nation and tongue.

The dream may be dreamed again. We are living in an age very similar to that of the early Roman Empire; all the ends of the earth are drawn together not into the same political system, but into the same region of thought. Men of all religions are meeting; we are acquainted as never before with all the religions of the world and are enabled to observe their differences and similarities and affinities. To us, too, the dream may come of a period when the veils that separate the different religions from each other will be drawn aside and the invitation of the Psalm, summoning all nations to a common worship of the great God whose creatures they all are, will be repeated and obeyed.

Of this we speak.

When we sing the hundredth Psalm in church or at a missionary meeting, perhaps we feel a slight sense of unreality in the words of it, especially if we know something of the religions outside our own. How can it be that Mohammedans and Buddhists, and the followers of Confucius, should assemble in one congregation and lift

up their voice to God in common acts of praise? Are not the different religions of mankind forever separate from each other? Does not each belong to a separate nation of which it is the inner soul, are they not shut out from each other by walls which can not be passed? Did God intend, we may ask in all reverence, that all the peoples of the world should belong to the same religion? Did He not make men different from each other in colour and feature and also in disposition and capacity and in the history through which they pass? Can we expect that they will abandon their age-long religions and adopt ours?

Well, there is something in each of us, not only in the practical missionary and in the enthusiast for missions, that forbids us to surrender the ideal of an ultimate religious unity. We all feel that human nature is the same all the world over. There is no race, we know, that is destitute of religion, however humble the religion be and whatever strange features it may present. There is nothing absurd in the idea of a religion that has room for all men under its wings, that sympathises with the aspirations of them all and is able to provide accommodation for them all. It may be possible that there is such a religion, or that it may in course of time be attained ; it may be possible that the nations may accept it, each keeping up at the same time what its history and its national character forbid it to abandon. The history of religion in the past gives abundant warrant to expect that a faith, proved to be superior to others and held by a community which heartily believes it and strictly lives up to it, will prevail over its neighbours, entering into manifold combinations with them, accepting what is best in them and giving up what of its own system is evidently not fitted to continue. The Christian religion is itself the greatest example of a faith which while enrich-

ing itself on every side with contributions of thought and ritual and practice, and giving up much that at one time seemed essential to its life, has prolonged its career and kept steadily to the pursuit of its goal of world-wide dominion. There is no reason to be seen in the nature of things or in the history of religion, why a worship of God should not be acknowledged over the whole world as true, if it proved to be superior to all others and was put before the world in a reasonable way. No doubt we have to take long views when we contemplate such a thing and have to overlook many a difficulty which may be in the way and many a possibility of error on the part of the adherents of such a religion, which may possibly damage its prospects irreparably. Still the thing is not impossible in the long run ; the countries and continents of the world are rapidly coming to a better understanding of each other (O, that this war were ended!) and it is not merely in material appliances which are rapidly adopted by one country from another, but in other respects as well, in methods of study, in systems of government, even in the conclusions of philosophy, even in the standards of taste, that the one-ness of the human mind is being found out by all. And why should this not be the case also in regard to religion? Those who believe heartily in their religion as one in which there is light and freedom and healing for all nations, may well repeat the challenge of our Psalm and call all nations to enter its gates, to tread its courts. They may well look forward to the time—even if embracing it afar off by faith—when all the world will come, as it is called, to be united in their holy mountain.

The hundredth Psalm is helpful to us not only in what it says but in what it does not say; and the Christian mission—for it is of this of course that we are speaking,

as Christianity is the only existing religion which conducts missions on a large scale—may well study the hymn that is used at its meetings. The Jewish call to the nations does not mention circumcision, nor sacrifice, nor the food-laws of the religion. It does not mention the Sabbath, nor in fact regard the religion at all as a system of law or of ritual. No obligation is spoken of but that to God; His authority only is appealed to; no human authority is spoken of. All that is asked is that the Gentiles should recognise the claim their Maker has upon them and acknowledge it by joining in the praise Israel lifts up to Him. The religion is presented to them in its most attractive aspect; only its central doctrine is put forward.

The Christian mission may well take note of this, whether in its dealings with the heathen abroad, or with the seeker for truth at home, or with that subtle heathenism which lurks in the breast of most of us. The lesson we are taught is that in seeking to propagate our religion we should strive to see it at its best, on its most attractive side, in the light in which it is most fitted to appeal to all. Another lesson is that we should see the men to whom we present it, at their best, that we should make their conversion easy to them by abstaining from any harsh demands, calling for no unnecessary sacrifices. The endeavour to see our religion at its best is the care primarily of theologians. It rests with them to determine what the religion is in its essence and what features of it are unessential. They have to present it in such a form that the acceptance of it may reasonably be expected of free and self-respecting men of whatever land. The theologians must tell us how Christianity may be presented to the heathen that they may accept it without being humiliated in their own eyes, sacrificing their judgment, or placing

themselves under an authority not entirely reasonable. This is a work which has to be done at home, not only by theologians, as we said, but also by all who are interested in the religion and desire to have it such as they need, full of truth and of genuine feeling, pointing them upwards and inspiring them to good works and holy living. The whole Christian nation must help in this if its missions are to succeed, for it is not only the missionary who carries the religion to other peoples; it is the nation that does so by its whole conduct and bearing.

The nation which sets out to communicate its religion to other nations must be a growing nation with a religion which is also growing and calls for its own propagation. Its missionaries will have to decide what is essential and vital in the message they carry, and on what part of the religion less emphasis may be laid. A missionary who has faced this searching problem could tell us better than a Scottish professor can about these sacrifices. There are parts of Christianity which can never be sacrificed. The British Missionary Society has long recognised the value of industrial pursuits in missions, the Churches generally now send out a complete Christian village, with artisans and craftsmen as well as teachers and medical men, to plant on heathen soil a living specimen of the Christian civilisation. Truthfulness, purity, honesty, decency, respect to parents must be strenuously enforced; all the world in every faith recognises that a good religion must produce these good works and that a teaching which does not produce them stands condemned. But how much of Christian doctrine is to be offered? Not the whole Shorter Catechism, one would say, nor the whole of the Common Prayer; something much simpler and more obvious will serve, if the religion is to prove attractive to young minds

and not to bewilder them. Doctrines which have been much doubted in the West may be withheld, at least for a time, until a soil has been prepared—if it ever will be—for such speculations. Original sin is such a doctrine, it is not fitted to encourage; the doctrine of the Trinity is not fitted for the immature, nor any high view of the Sacraments. We would judge also that the doctrine of the threefold ministry of the Church and of the succession of the clergy was fitted to confuse rather than to build up young converts and that auricular confession will not tend to foster spiritual vigour among them. But, on the other hand, what can inspire and invigorate so strongly and permanently as to confront the convert with the great God who is the Maker of the world and his Maker, and to tell him that religion is simply walking with God, trusting Him for all things in this world and the next, seeking to have His spirit and to do His will? Along with this doctrine there must be of course the practical training in religious duties; one does not have such a God without wishing to serve Him in every possible and appropriate way; one naturally desires to speak to Him in prayer, to frequent the place where His people meet to express gratitude and homage to Him, to show kindness to the poor among His people and to help to bring others to His feet. Once the impression has been formed of the great Being with whom life is to be led, it will not be hard to form these habits and to make them appear easy and delightful.

The missionary of to-day is in a far better position than the Psalmist to preach this doctrine and to train in these practices. He has the help and example of that being whose life was fuller of God than that of any other descendant of Adam, and who was filled by this religion, which

had in him full sway, with a power and charm which will never fade. It was to this God that he prayed "I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes." He never suffered any other power to come between him and the most High. He loved the world he lived in and understood it with rare insight as the work of infinite goodness. He understood God's children and could sketch them with such skill that we can not doubt he loved them and sympathised with them. He spent his life in befriending them, especially the weak and helpless and children. With such a guide to true religion we find the way to it open and easy and can call all men with assured emphasis to enter the gates of it and tread its courts.

These things we have put under the image of the missionary and his converts, but they concern us all. We are all made by God, the sheep of His pasture, the flock of His hand. It is the duty of all of us to praise Him and to live to His glory. In this age of restless movement it is well to be reminded of this fundamental aspect of our position in the world; that we are not our own and did not come of ourselves but in obedience to a higher power. If once we come to believe this thoroughly, if people generally come to believe strongly in God as their Creator and in the claims this gives Him on His creatures, we should not perhaps be saved from all religious uncertainty, but our doubts would trouble us much less, we should feel that the important things were settled for us beyond the power of doubt to shake them.

No doubt it seems to us in this age as if everything about religion were uncertain. The moorings which bound us not very long ago so strictly to the old faith

have for many of us altogether parted and we are left to find the way for ourselves among the manifold currents and the fitful breezes of thought. Many are sadly unsettled, many have forsaken the Church, and seem to themselves to be in the position of having to choose a religion and not knowing very well how to set about it. The great freedom and unbounded tolerance the age enjoys are no doubt good; one hopes that they may lead to a faith more deeply founded and settled in reason. Meanwhile we are like Justin or Tatian who went from philosopher to philosopher and could not attach themselves to any. A view on this side appeals to us and a view on that side, and we try to add it to our system; we see good in Islam and also in Buddhism, and allow each in some degree to influence us; we incline now to a code of positive injunction, and again to the plan of trusting God and ourselves without a code. We see the merits of the worship of saints and those of mysticism and those of the doctrine of purgatory. We find science to provide a sufficient religion, or the cult of beauty. So the poor soul is tossed to and fro without any firm anchorage.

That no doubt is the experience of the age; the individual does not pass through it all and yet the individual has part in it in proportion to his information and his idiosyncrasy. The age is willing enough to follow the truth and to do what it prescribes; but it wants a principle strong enough to drive it forward sufficiently amid the bewildering multiplicity of views and tendencies that are operating on every side. But such a strong guiding view is perhaps not far off. Signs are to be seen on many sides of a great change that is coming in men's thought about religion; that the period of dispute and uncertainty is passing away and the period approaching in which the posi-

tive convictions will be reached for which the disputes of the last generation have prepared the way. The sciences have ceased to be negative to religion. Their task is accomplished of clearing away the errors that rested on their various fields and they are considering the positive results which are left and are coming to the conclusion that the spiritual interpretation of the universe, pointed to by the spiritual instincts of mankind, may be right. Philosophy is coming to the same conclusion. The Bible is now seen in a reasonable light and appears as the record of a long advance in the knowledge of God, which came to its highest point in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. The churches are imperatively called to preach a God whom science and philosophy as well as the Bible and our own natural perception of the grandeur and beauty of the world alike declare to us. The sciences do not forbid them but call on them to declare Him. The time may be at hand when lovers of truth beholding, each in his own field of enquiry, the wisdom and the purpose of a great spiritual Being, will turn to Him with the acknowledgment that of Him and to Him and through Him are all things, to whom be glory forever.

So do we trust and hope. Happy those who will behold this great sunrise! When the tremendous conviction that God is their Maker and has a right to claim all things of them and that He and no other has appointed them their tasks in His great world ; when this conviction comes back to their minds and fully possesses them, then all things will be made new to them and all the difficulties which now beset their religious life will appear to them as trifles by the side of this great guiding truth.

II

PAULINE STUDIES

I

THE PREPARATION OF THE APOSTLE PAUL AT TARSUS

A paper read to the Theological Society of the United Free Church College of Edinburgh, October 11, 1912.

CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN,

I have first of all to thank you for the distinguished honour you have done me in electing me your President for this winter. It was a kind act on your part to choose a representative of another School of Divinity. It rests with me to prove it a wise one. Whether I succeed or fail, let me assure you of the deep respect I bear to your College, the teachers in which I count my friends, and for your Principal, who has done so much for the religion of Scotland.

You leave your President free to fix the subject of the Address which it is his principal function to deliver at the opening of the winter session. I have chosen for my subject *The Preparation of the Apostle Paul at Tarsus*. A good deal of light has been shed of late from various quarters on that subject; and it may be useful to point out how it now appears. The Apostle Paul can never cease to interest Christian people profoundly. He adapted the Gospel to us Gentiles; we owe him hearty thanks for that,

and of course we wish to know what manner of man he was and how his great work was done. But that is much to wish for, and involves wide study. The introduction to the study of Jesus is simple and easy in comparison. Few scholars now think that the origin of the teaching of Jesus is to be sought outside the limits of his own people. The great Semitic students who have given attention to the subject recognise in Jesus the natural and consummate flower of Jewish thought and aspiration ; he is a pure Son of the East ; no doubt at a time when East and West alike were full of thoughts as wide as humanity and as deep as the human soul. The *History of the Jewish People* is the name of the book which forms the best introduction to the study of the life and teaching of Jesus. Schürer was the writer of it ; you all know it.

Paul, on the other hand, requires a different introduction ; he is a citizen of a Greek town and a citizen of the commonwealth of Rome, he is influenced by Greek thought, and he is a traveller and addresses himself to a variety of towns in different countries, each with a worship of its own. To introduce ourselves to the work Paul did, we have to study the Roman Empire, its political institutions, the religions of its provinces, and not least the religious movements which went on apart from the town worships. Each chapter of Acts has to be put as far as possible in its true position in history, and in each Epistle it has to be determined what the people it addresses knew and thought and felt already about religion. And of course we wish to know how the Gospel Paul addressed to all these people was formed and built up in his mind.

Two books may be named which the student of Paul will do well to have beside him. The first is Sir William Ramsay's *Cities of St. Paul* ; the other is Wendland's

Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum, in which the latest enquiries as to the thought and the religion of the world in which Paul moved are summed up and arranged. It is a book very highly to be recommended to the theological student.

Schürer will also be of use to the student of Paul for his statements about the Synagogue in the Dispersion and about the education of their pupils by the Pharisees. There is less to say on that side of the subject, the outlines of which have long been known.

I wish to speak of the obligations of the Apostle to the Gentile world in the midst of which he was born and brought up until he went to Jerusalem to sit for some years at the feet of Gamaliel. On the question of how old he was when that removal took place I shall have some remarks to make; it must not, I think, be placed too early. The obligations we shall speak of which he owed to his upbringing at Tarsus are those:

1. His obligations to the city of Tarsus.
2. His obligations to the heathen religions, public and private, with which he became acquainted.
3. His obligations to Greek philosophy, by which he was to some degree influenced.
4. His obligations to the Greek-speaking Synagogue in which he was nurtured, and to the proselytes he met there.

1. His obligations to the city of Tarsus. In Sir William Ramsay's *Cities of St. Paul* there is a deeply interesting chapter on this city, based on personal observation and historical research. Tarsus was for about a millennium a large and flourishing commercial centre. At its best it had a population twice as large as that of

Edinburgh ; its buildings filling a space six miles broad. Early generations of its citizens had created wonderful works to secure and develop its position. As Glasgow during last century canalised the Clyde, so did Tarsus the Cydnus, in order that sea-bourne commerce could sail up into its streets. A road also had been made for wheel-traffic across the mountains to the north, and so a great trade route had been provided with the interior. Thus, in spite of an unattractive position and a poor climate, Tarsus had come to be one of the leading cities of Asia Minor. Men do not look back on works like these without being proud of the masculine vigour of their forefathers, and Paul is evidently proud of the place of his birth when he speaks of being a citizen of Tarsus in Cilicia, no mean city (Acts xxi. 39).

What of the inner life and character of this great city in Paul's day? No excavations have yet been made to bring before us the temples and other buildings. The older coins represent oriental deities, in the later ones the Greek spirit prevails more; we have the city-goddess seated with the river god at her feet. The spirit of the city is more oriental than Greek; even in the second century A.D. the ladies were veiled when they went out on the street. But the constitution and the arrangements of the town were Greek. When Jerusalem was to be made a Greek city by Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 B.C. it was supplied with a palaestra, which was an offence to Jewish feeling. Tarsus was reconstituted three years earlier by the same monarch, and no doubt similarly endowed. New bodies of settlers were brought in, Greeks from Argolis, Jews from we know not where. These Greek and Jewish settlers came to be the most influential part of the population, and the guidance of affairs lay mostly with them.

The Greeks were the livelier citizens and more given to change, the Jews more inclined to support the government, under whatever various heads. Paul's statement that he was a citizen of Tarsus implies that his family had been for some time settled in that town; you could not be a citizen of a town in old times without belonging to a tribe which had been recognised as being part of the constitution, and this had been the case with the Jewish settlers of Antiochus. And if, as Paul asserts, he was born a Roman citizen, his father must have held that rank before him, rewarded in that way no doubt, Paul's father or grandfather, for services rendered to one of the quickly changing heads of the Roman power.

These facts suggest that he was born to look on the world rather from above than from below. Deissmann, intent on his thesis that the New Testament books were written by the people and for the people, will have it that Paul did not belong to the upper literary class but to that of the manual workers. But it is not necessary to believe that because he was a tent-maker in his missionary days, he depended from his youth on that craft. The facts we have mentioned as to the position of his family at Tarsus suggest that he had it in his power to tread in his father's steps, consorting with the leading men of the city and rising in time to a position in its government. If we ask why, though a member of a good family and heir no doubt to some wealth, he came to depend for his daily bread on manual labour, the answer suggests itself that he incurred the displeasure of his kindred, either when he became a Christian or when, at an earlier period, he gave up the career that was open to him at Tarsus and went to Jerusalem to study, or from some other reason. In the latter part of his career, when his trials and imprisonment were

going on, he was not without resources, as Sir William Ramsay points out.[1]

If it be asked what the Apostle owed to his native city, it must be said that the position of Tarsus was fitted to suggest wide views; it was a great meeting-place of East and West, and a place of strategical importance. One could not live there without hearing of every part of the known world and partaking of great memories and high politics. It must also be said that he must have come in contact there with heathens of a superior class and have learned to understand their position. And that political loyalty to the Empire and the Emperor, the expression of which in Romans xiii. has been of such value to Christendom, was a thing he inherited in his father's house.

From heathen religion Paul was of course shut off in this Jewish home. The Jews were called to be separate from the Gentiles among whom they lived, and to preserve their purity in every way. The Jews judged the gods of the heathens to be demons, and it was necessary for them to have nothing to do with them. In the religion of the temple there was little to tempt them; the system was to them a mass of absurdities and repulsive immoralities; it was to punish them for their sins that they had been allowed to fall into it; so Paul judges in Romans i., in a tirade against heathenism, which he may have composed long before and then included in Romans. What the Jews generally said about the idols of heathen temples was that they were dumb idols; they uttered no doctrine, their priests were silent. The welfare of the city was held to be bound up with the temple religion; and even a Jewish boy was bound to know of the processions which took place in the city, of the gifts and sacrifices offered to the

[1] *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 35 and 310.

gods, of the joint worship of the Emperor and the city god. But he had nothing to do with it, it did not directly touch him.

In this he was not in a very different position from the more serious and religious-minded of his heathen neighbours. To them too the gods of the temples were dumb as to any teaching about life and conduct. When they were in any difficulty about deeper matters of experience and duty, it was not to the temples or the priests that they resorted. They might be advised to offer a gift or make a vow to some god, or they might repair to an oracle for a word to guide them, or consult a soothsayer or a magician as to what they should do; but the stronger spirits among them no longer looked to such devices for the deeper guidance they required. It was to the philosopher not to the priest that they betook themselves; the philosopher's lecture room rather than the temple was their church, in which their spirits found the bracing they needed, comfort in affliction, guidance in difficulty, assurance for the future.

The philosophy prevalent in Paul's time was Stoicism. It was not at this time a speculative philosophy, but was entirely concentrated on practical questions; it had given up the pursuit of science and attended to this alone. It shared, of course, the unbelief in the temple-gods which had been growing in the mind of Greece for centuries and had arrived at a pale theism, a belief in one good God, maker of all things, giver of good laws and strict judge of men, which it strove to apply to the whole of human life. It was, in fact, the religion of serious and progressive men in the early empire. Its teachers were inspired by a strong missionary ardour, and felt themselves to be called by God to be shepherds, guides of men, and to spend their whole lives in this God-appointed task. Seneca acts as a kind of

court-director of conduct under Nero, whose tutor he had been. In his writings one finds every kind of warning against vice and evil, every kind of encouragement to noble sentiments and pure living. Epictetus, the slave philosopher of whose teaching we have so excellent an account in Dr. Abbott's *Silanus the Christian*, gave lectures in Nicopolis which were largely resorted to, following in his mode of teaching, his master, Musonius, though with more point and genius than the latter. The teaching of Epictetus and Musonius was not written down by themselves; what we have of it is due to the notes taken by their pupils. And Stoic preachers were to be seen everywhere; some lecturing as University Professors, as Athenodorus, who had been tutor to Augustus, did at Tarsus in the generation before Paul; but many of them in the guise of travelling missionaries, who appeared in the market-place of a city, as Paul did at Athens, and addressed the crowd there. There is little difference at this time between the Stoic and the Cynic preacher; the Cynic is the ruder and more yelping in manner, as the name was by many held to imply. Both alike insisted with everyone that he should consider his ways; that he should give up attaching value to outside possessions and advantages which had not any real value for the person; that he should despise pain and not think it an evil, that he should be in earnest with himself and do what he could to save his soul.

From the Stoics Paul derived a great deal, and the serious students of the Epistles must study the Stoics too. It is not likely that a Jewish boy would be allowed to attend the lectures at the University of Tarsus, where the best Stoic doctrine was to be heard; but nothing could prevent his making acquaintance with the doctrine taught

in the high places of his city, and if he did not hear it at the University, he heard it on the streets and in the talk of other lads. We know that he knew it because it meets us to a large extent in his writings. He could not withdraw himself from the intellectual atmosphere of his age; and, in fact, we find that

1. He said many of the same things as the Stoic teachers did.
2. He said them in the same way, made use of the same methods of statement.
3. His view of his own function and place as a missionary is closely analogous to that of the Stoics.

The similarity has been chiefly remarked as between Paul and Seneca. So strongly were the Early Church Fathers impressed by it that Tertullian declared that Seneca is often found on our side, *saepe noster*, while Jerome is more positive and speaks of "our own Seneca." A correspondence between Paul and Seneca exists which, while undoubtedly a forgery, testifies to a belief that the two men were intimate and to a large extent in agreement; Calvin wrote commenting on this. No one reading Paul and Seneca together can deny that they very often do agree; but the same is the case with Paul and Epictetus, or Paul and Musonius, neither of whom could he ever have met. If Seneca speaks of purity and inner freedom as the first good to be pursued, Paul also protests that he will not be brought under the power of any outward thing. If Seneca declares all men to be the children of God and therefore relatives, Paul too has his "Is God the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles?" If Seneca speaks of slavery in generous language and declares the slave to be of the same nature and entitled to equal

consideration with himself, Paul speaks of slavery as a thing indifferent, which does not interfere with inner freedom. Onesimus is to him no more a slave but above a slave, a brother beloved. If Seneca speaks of God coming down to dwell with the good man, to Paul, too, the body of the Christian is God's temple, the promises are fulfilled that God will walk with men and dwell in them. No doubt these ideas are reached in different ways in the two cases, and in a different atmosphere of accompanying thought; but in both cases thought has risen to this height; in both we find a God who regards all men alike as His children, and is ready to bestow encouragement and comfort on all; and the duty of men to regard themselves as citizens of a commonwealth which embraces all and to practice humanity and kindness to all. This is the doctrine of Stoicism as we see it in the other Stoic teachers, and the agreement of Seneca and Paul in it is to be explained by its being the general tendency of the moral thought of the century. Paul must have heard somewhere the doctrine of the Stoics and found much of it congenial. If the resemblances between Pauline thought and Stoicism appear too vague and general to warrant such a conclusion, or if it be thought that all Paul had of this sort might be attained from purely Jewish sources, from the teaching of the Prophets reinforced by that of Christ, yet the resemblance in point of style and rhetorical method between him and the Stoic preachers can scarcely be got rid of in this way. Read Epictetus and Paul together and you find, not perhaps very often, the same words, but very distinctly the same style, the same literary devices for carrying on an argument, the same enumeration of details leading up to an effective climax, the same asking of questions, setting up of an adversary to refute, or quoting a proverb to give

the discourse a turn. All these rhetorical means Paul has in common with the Diatribe, the discussions or Address in which the Stoics commonly presented their views to their audience. The Diatribe is a spoken, not a written Address, and when Paul gets into long series of questions and answers or into moving catalogues of what he has had to suffer, or what Christians generally are exposed to, we judge that he is writing or dictating as he spoke, and if he spoke in that way, then he spoke just as the Stoic missionaries did. The following piece is by Zeno, a Stoic preacher three hundred years before Paul, of whose sermons one or two have been preserved:

> "Art thou an old man? Do not seek for the things that belong to a young man. Or art thou feeble? Seek not the part of a strong man, to carry burdens and put thy neck under the yoke. Is any man in circumcision? Seek not to get rid of it. Is any man called in uncircumcision? Let him not be circumcised. Art thou called, being a slave? Let it not trouble thee."

It is clear that Paul must have practised that style of address, that he must have heard it used, and seen it to be effective, and given himself trouble to perfect himself in the method. Other resources of Stoic oratory may be noticed in him. Catalogues of virtues and vices, catalogues of duties, to parents, children, slaves, masters, rulers, teachers.

The Stoic teacher regards himself, though childless, as father of all mankind, and as appointed by God to play a parent's part to all whom he can influence. And so Paul says, "You have not many fathers through Jesus Christ. I have begotten you in the Gospel. Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel."

The impression left by the comparison of Paul with the Stoic speakers and writers is that he was acquainted with the philosophy of his day and shared its higher aspirations, and further that he not only knew the rhetorical art of the Stoic preachers, but had to some extent studied it and practised it himself. At what period of his life this took place is a question.

Man wants philosophy no doubt; wants it most at times when old beliefs are failing and the temples growing dark; but he wants more than philosophy. Stoicism did what was humanly possible to supply the place of a vanishing religion and present the world with a living God and a code of moral duties. But when Stoicism was most active and all lands were pervaded by its preachers, the world showed it wanted more than philosophy; it wanted a God with some history behind him and some positive claim to human devotion; it wanted rites in which the faithful could join and a service of God capable of absorbing its enthusiasm. The hey-day of Stoicism is just the period when new religions came pouring over the Empire from the East and gathering the multitudes to their fold. Dr. Dill gives good accounts in his book, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, of the worship of Magna Mater, from Phrygia, which was brought to Rome about 203 B.C. Her interest lay in her love for the youth Attis, who was punished for his unfaithfulness to her by mutilation, followed afterwards by restoration. He also has a chapter on the worship at Rome of Isis and Osiris, and one on Mithra. Many other Oriental religions spread westwards at this time; Adonis may be mentioned and Astarte. The rites in which these gods were worshipped were originally of a wild and revolting nature. In the Bacchae

of Euripides we find an account of the orgiastic cult of Dionysius, who was sought over hill and dale by bands of enthusiasts, who mourned bitterly for his death, and whose mourning turned to joy at his resurrection.

M. Cumont in his book on the religions of the East in Paganism gives a lucid explanation of the reason why these Eastern worships were so successful in the West. They were universal in their nature, disregarding the limits of race and country, and claiming to be received by all. The deity addressed all men with an air of positiveness and authority, he wanted all for his subjects. Their priests were entirely devoted to their service, they were men who had forsaken all to follow God, and had separated themselves from the world by painful mutilations. Their services in the towns were magnificently organised, with an elaborate liturgy and a complete hierarchy of holy orders.

In the mysteries which formed a part of many of these religions the virtue of the systems was applied to individual converts and believers. After a period of probation in which, in some cases at least, he was encouraged to put off all the pollution of his former life and to aim at the highest standard of goodness, the candidate was admitted, with an oath of secrecy, to see things kept hidden and to hear words it was not lawful to utter, and so became initiated, *μύστης*, *τέλειος*. The experience of this rite is seen, from several descriptions of it which have been preserved, to have been of a very arresting and overwhelming nature, and to have introduced the subject of it to a new stage of moral and spiritual life. The religion connected with the mysteries came to be regarded as the highest stage of the religious life of that age, it provided itself with a set of terms and with an edifying literature of its own. You are aware of the controversy, in which

Professor Kennedy of this College has taken a notable part, on the question whether the Apostle Paul was indebted for some of his terms and notions to the mystery-religions of his day. If he did use a dozen or a score of words which were employed in a technical sense in mystery cults, he must have known that his readers would take the words in the sense in which they were accustomed to use them. The fact that these words occur in the Septuagint and had a meaning of their own in the Jewish religion, would not alter that, and Paul's use of the words to the Corinthians would lead to a little confusion. But Paul would use them in the Jewish, not the Gentile sense, for all that; and would hope that his converts would learn to use them with a new meaning. It is a question whether this belongs to the earlier life of Paul. The mystery-religion phrases he uses he may have picked up afterwards when he came to parts of the world where that type of religion was specially in vogue. It will probably be found that the phrases in question do not enter deeply into the earlier Gospel of the Apostle and are not essential to his thought.

In another way the Oriental religions, which were moving to the West, may have influenced him more deeply. The religions of Attis, Adonis, Osiris and Mithra, which must all have been known to him, all partook alike of the great features we spoke of above. None of them united itself to any particular people or class of men; they addressed themselves to all alike. And it was to the heart they spoke. They pointed to a God with whom man could feel sympathy for something he had done or suffered and who asked for acceptance of his yoke on that score. There is one feature in which these Eastern cults broadly agree. When we read the account in Firmicus

Maternus, a Latin Christian writer of the fourth century, of the errors of the profane religions, and read what he says of one after another of the cults with which Christianity was still confronted in his day, Attis, Osiris, Dionysius, there is one feature common to all those worships, that the God who is adored is a being who died and rose again. Each of these religions, and there were others at an earlier time, which shared this with them, called on the believer to unite himself to the God in the varying phases of his career, in the tragedy which carried him down into death, in the triumph of his resurrection. It may have suggested itself to Paul that there must be some truth in religions like these which proved acceptable to so many, that the religion of a dying and reviving Deity was that to which the world might be converted.

So much then it was possible to experience at Tarsus. The attempt of philosophy to perform the office of religion; the coming of more powerful religions to the place left vacant for them; the sealing to many individuals in the mysteries, which grew more and more refined, of what these religions offered.

We have to turn in conclusion to an experience of another sort which the Apostle must certainly have undergone in his early life: his attendance at the synagogue and all that it involved, and specially what he saw and heard of the approaches of pious Gentiles to the synagogue worship.

Much of what Paul puts before his converts in his Epistles is not new to Christianity, but common to the synagogue and the Church. The synagogue, like the Church at Corinth or at Rome, was surrounded by pagans, and had to adjust itself as best it could to its situation amidst a hard and critical world. Paul learned from his childhood to value the privileges of Israel; and also that

these privileges demanded discipline and sacrifice on the part of those who had them. "Come out from among them and be separate," he was taught, "and touch not the unclean thing." It was forbidden to the Jew to have anything to do with idolatry, to enter an idol-temple or eat meat offered to idols. Care had to be taken to live unblamably, and not to incur any reproach from the Gentiles; there was to be no compromise with other religions, and yet the Gentiles were to be attracted and not repelled by what they saw of Jewish life. Conduct was to be grave and circumspect; no duty was to be neglected. The synagogue also had its code of duties to those in various situations, duties of parents, of children, of slaves and masters, of wife and of husband; in Romans xii. and I. Thessalonians v. a Jew of the synagogue would see nothing to criticise, nothing that he had not been taught from his youth. Of the catalogue of virtues and vices, as in Galatians v., the same may be said; the Jew would readily accept them; and the estimates of heathenism in Romans i. and ii. also contained nothing the Jew trained in the synagogue would find new or strange. Just so would he consider that the vices of heathenism were closely connected with idolatry; that they were, in fact, the punishment inflicted by God on those who turned away from the knowledge of Himself God had given them in His works and in their conscience. And just as Paul, would the liberal Jew of the Dispersion consider that the Gentiles, who had not the law, yet, if they set their hearts on the best that was open to them and sought for glory and honour and immortality, showed the work of the law to be written in their hearts, and would stand in the judgment.

All this the synagogue was capable of teaching; and Paul no doubt learned it there. There is much in the

Epistles that points to the Rabbinic schools at Jerusalem rather than to the synagogue at Tarsus as its source; his hair-splitting exegesis of the Old Testament and his argument by a ladder of Old Testament texts, each torn from its context and invested with a meaning the original writer never dreamed of. But his ethics, his estimates of the various duties, his manly attitude towards a heathen world, his sympathy with all the good to be found in heathen religion, all this he might learn from his parents in his home and from the synagogue.

And something more. When he went to the synagogue he saw there, taking part in the worship as if it belonged to them, people who were not Jews, but Greeks and Anatolians. So it was in all the synagogues in which Paul preached in Acts. In Asia Minor and Ionia and Macedonia and Greece we hear of those who feared God as part of the audience in every synagogue. At Antioch Paul uses a double address when he opens his mouth to speak to the congregation (xiii. 16), "Men of Antioch," he says, *i.e.* born Jews, "and ye that fear God," *i.e.* you who, though not born Jews, take part in the worship. As at Antioch, so at Philippi, at Thessalonica, at Berea, Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, there is this twofold congregation in the synagogue. At Tarsus there is no doubt it was the same. The synagogue was a missionary agency among the Gentiles. It kept up the invitation of Psalm 100, which calls on all lands to come and join in the worship of Jehovah, and describes that worship as easy and delightful. The Psalms are full of that invitation; the Prophets go great lengths in anticipating the time when "people that knew not thee shall run unto thee because of the Lord thy God and the Holy One of Israel." The Jews of the Dispersion took all this seriously, and kept the door of the synagogue

open to their Gentile neighbours. The Jews in Palestine had less of this spirit, because the Gentiles had subjected and oppressed them and acted as the destroyers of their hopes. Instead of God's house at Jerusalem being a house of prayer for all nations, the Gentiles were kept out of a great part of it and threatened, by an inscription, with death, if they presumed to go a step further. And the part which was open to them, our Lord says, was spoiled for their use ; it was turned into a market.

In Greek-speaking lands, however, many Gentiles were attracted to the synagogue. They found there a true philosophy, an effective religion and a satisfactory code of morals ; all, in fact, that the Gentile world was seeking and could not find fully, either in Stoicism or in Mithra or Attis. It was the religion itself that brought them there ; for the Jews, though respected for their strict morals and orderly life, were not great favourites with their neighbours. The services were not very formal. Moses was read every Sabbath day and also sections of the prophetical books ; there were addresses ; strangers who were present might be invited to speak. But there was no great formality. At Alexandria the synagogue appears to have stood open from morning to evening of the Sabbath. At Philippi Paul addresses the women who had come together, apparently before the arrival of their husbands. There was room at the meetings for argument and conversation as well as for set discourse. A very lively and elastic meeting it must have been, and fitted to impress strongly in various ways the young who were taken to it with their elders.

They would notice that their elders were much interested in the presence at the meeting of the Gentile adherents. These, of course, were not the worst or the weakest of

their class. Men of weak character could not have taken the step of joining the synagogue and exposing themselves to the criticism and raillery of their neighbours. They were well-to-do, respected persons, the honourable women are more spoken of than their male friends; it was easier for a woman to join the synagogue than for a man. That made them the more valuable to the Jews; the devout or God-worshippers were of great financial importance to the body, and they gave the synagogue importance and influence in the eyes of the public.

The synagogue, then, was something of a missionary agency; it carried on a propaganda of the Jewish faith among the Gentiles, not unsuccessfully. And in a Jewish house in a Greek town discussions would be heard as to the way to bring the Gentiles over. The names would be mentioned of those who had lately joined, and of those thought likely to follow them; the advantages would be rehearsed which the Greek gained by joining the synagogue, and the hindrances which kept him from doing so. Whether the hindrances in his way could be removed or made less, the question would be eagerly discussed. The principal hindrance, of course, was the necessity of circumcision to secure for the Greek a share of the blessing promised to Abraham. To incorporate oneself by a physical operation in another race, to transfer to Jerusalem one's centre of loyalty, to take on one's self the whole yoke of the law, its regulations about food, its fasts and festivals, this was a great deal to ask. And yet a Gentile could not be fully a child of Abraham without it. There was no half-way house; without this one could only be a listener, not a member. Had this hindrance not existed, the conversion of Gentiles would have proceeded much more rapidly, the triumphs of the Church in Gentile lands would

have fallen to the share of the synagogue. Do you see how much Paul may have learned, in the synagogue, that fitted and disposed him for the work to which he was afterwards called by God?

It might appear that what we have said is somewhat speculative in its nature, but we have dealt more on what was likely to happen than on what can be positively proved to have happened. That is inevitable in every attempt to reconstruct the past. Paul tells us hardly anything of his life before he was a Christian, and when we try to piece together the influences which made him what he was, we cannot have positive certainty. We cannot hear Paul talking Stoicism with his contemporaries, nor see him as he watched the Stoic preacher and picked up some of his tones and turns of words. But the language of his Epistles makes it practically certain that he did the one and the other of these things. It is practically certain also that he knew about the dying and reviving gods of the Oriental cults, and that he knew about the mysteries and the language connected with them.

There is a great deal to find out about these things, and it will be found out by younger men. It may be that some students of this College may conceive the ambition of following the steps of their Professor, or the career of the lamented Professor Hogg of Manchester, who was trained in Divinity in this College and died too early, one of our foremost Assyriologists. Some of you, too, may help to find out about what Paul saw and heard around him in his youth. If we could be sure how old he was when he left Tarsus and went to Jerusalem to be trained under Gamaliel, we could see the way a little further. Did he know the Stoic phrases and doctrines and the religions of

Attis and Mithra before he went to Jerusalem, or was it after his conversion that he came to know them? Means may perhaps be found in the New Testament itself to determine that point and to help us to decide whether his broad humanitarian sentiment and his brief abrupt style are reminiscences of his early days at Tarsus, something the youth brought with him to College and did not forget, as happens still to College youths; or whether, after his conversion, when he went back to the city of his youth, he set himself to learn from those who had tried it, how best to preach religion to the Gentiles.

It is wonderful how much he represents to us the great thoughts of his age through which Providence was preparing the nations for Christ; wonderful how he transformed these thoughts to the service of a Gospel of which we, in this far off age and clime, still in an increasing measure feel the power.

II

ST. PAUL'S VIEW OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST[1]

THE position in which the Christian world now finds itself with regard to the history of the founder of the Christian religion is a very interesting and, in some respects, a very serious one. Christianity is a historical religion; it is not, like Confucianism, a matter of moral precept only, the truth of which is independent of its historical connection; nor like Shintoism, a worship of spirits which are feared rather than known, and which have no relation to human history; it is based on certain occurrences which we believe to have actually taken place in a particular country, and at a particular period of the world's chronology. It is by going back to these occurrences, contemplating them again and again, and receiving into his spirit the message with which he feels them to be charged for him, that the Christian feeds his higher life. The great fact of Christianity is that God sent His Son into the world; and how this took place the New Testament is believed to tell us. A certain amount of historical information is therefore necessary to the Christian. He desires, and thinks it possible, to know the Saviour as a historical person, to whose commandments he can listen in

[1] This paper, reprinted by the kind permission of Mr. Francis Griffiths, was the first in his series of *Essays for the Times*, and appeared in 1905.

order to obey them, whose concrete example he can place before his eyes, whose presence, guided by those who were near Him on earth, he can himself enter.

This requirement of the Christian life seems, at first sight, at least, to have been adequately provided for. We have four Gospels, each of them an account of the Saviour's life and teaching, written apparently by one who was in a good position to undertake the task. Few will deny that each of these writers took the greatest trouble to do his work adequately, or that each of them produced a book, judged by whatever standard, of the most singular interest. Each of these books, moreover, is to a large extent independent of the others, so that taken jointly they represent to us various points of view and various lines of tradition. What can the Christian ask more? Does not the agreement of these books place the main outline of the Saviour's life in a position beyond question? Does not their independence of each other, and the rich variety of their materials, remove from the picture they give us all sameness and monotony and furnish to devout study a theme of inexhaustible and ever-changing interest?

This comfortable sense of great possessions has been very seriously disturbed of late by criticism. Like all the ancient records which have descended to our time, the Gospels have had to submit in this age of accurate historical enquiry to strict scientific examination. That is inevitable; no one can prevent it; to many it appears even a very desirable thing that the history on which our faith is based should be thus sifted, so that we may be sure that the foundation on which our house is built is rock and not sand. But the time when the process is going on is one of some degree of trial to us all. Not to be sure whether the stories of Jesus, which we have always prized, are

actually true, or whether He really spoke the words we have made it our duty to obey, that is hard. We have made up our mind no doubt that the fourth Gospel is not to be regarded as historical in the same way as the first three, and that the discourses it contains, while real sayings of Jesus may be present here and there in them, were not spoken as the Evangelist wrote them down. But the battle has now come to the synoptic Gospels too, which were thought to be so reliable, and it seems to many as if our historical information about Jesus Christ were crumbling away altogether, and as if nothing were left us that we can depend on. Even those narratives are being impugned, which have always been regarded as essential to the faith, and which are taken up into the creeds. Of the words of the Lord we are told that the tradition is most uncertain ; the discourses are artificially put together by the evangelists ; very few of the sayings can be referred with confidence to the occasion on which they were spoken ; of few is the original meaning beyond doubt.

From all this the conclusion has been drawn, not only in this country, but by the adherents of other religions than ours in India and other lands, and not only by those sceptically inclined, but by many open-minded people who are otherwise well inclined to religion, that the Gospels are fatally discredited as sources of historical information, and that the great structure of Christian belief thus rests on unsound foundations. This objection to Christianity will in time pass away, as it comes to be seen more clearly that all the historical religions are, broadly speaking, in the same position ; the lives of all their founders are recorded in books which require criticism and re-arrangement to make them yield up to us the actual facts contained in them. That the books were written in a naïve way, and

that legend mingles in them with fact, does not prove that they contain no history. For all their imperfections they may still represent in a sufficient manner those vital facts out of which the religions themselves arose. Still in the meantime we are passing through a time of trial to many, who fear that in the criticism of the Gospels their Lord has been taken away from them.

It is the object of this essay to point out that the position in which we stand at present as to our information about the life of Christ is in certain respects closely analogous to that of the Apostle Paul, who, when he carried on his Gentile mission, had not only not four Gospels, but probably no written work at all to refer to for the facts of the Saviour's life and death. Though the Apostle was in this situation he made no complaints, so far as we hear, as to the inadequacy of his knowledge about Christ, nor would he allow that the Apostles who had been with Jesus during His earthly ministry and possessed the living memory of His acts and sayings, were in any way better qualified than himself for knowing Christ and acting as his representatives. He claimed, in fact, that he knew Christ, in some respects, and these the most essential, better than they did. Though he had not known the Saviour as a man on the earth, yet he believed that he had been enabled better than they had been to apprehend the nature of Christ's person and the object of His coming to the world. And the view which he took of Christ's person and Christ's mission was accepted by the Church. It was through St. Paul and not through the older apostles, who were in close contact with the early traditions deposited in the Gospels, that the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, and of the atonement he had made with God, first arose and passed into the general belief of Christians. We shall

seek to show in a simple way in the following pages, how the Apostle Paul was led to that higher knowledge of the person and work of Christ, which, though not derived from the earliest Gospels, is still cherished by Christendom. That higher knowledge of Christ, as it was not derived from the Gospels, is still, if we can hold it fast, in a large measure independent of them, and those who can rise to it need not be seriously disturbed by what criticism of the Gospels may establish or disprove.

The Apostle Paul does not appear to have had any complete written account of Jesus to put into the hands of his converts. The earliest of our four Gospels, that according to Mark, was written not less than fifteen years after the foundation of the Church at Corinth. When the Apostle has occasion to mention to his converts facts of the Gospel history, he does not appeal to any written book or document for them; he appeals to tradition, and speaks of what he had "received from the Lord," 1 Cor. xi. 23 (where it is held by some that he is quoting one of the revelations he had received), and of what he had delivered to his converts and they had received from him, 1 Cor. xv. 1-11. He had received accordingly from some quarter information about the life of Christ, which he was able to communicate to his converts. On many occasions we find him quoting words of the Lord, and appealing to the Lord as the supreme authority on questions of practical difficulty which arose in the Church. In Gal. vi. 2, 1 Thess. iv. 15 he quotes sayings of Christ which do not appear as he quotes them in any of our Gospels. On various matters he considers that he possesses a direct word of the Lord to settle a problem of conduct (1 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14). In other cases he says he has no word of the Lord and exercises his own judgment (1 Cor. vii. 12, 17, 25).

It is to be observed that it is, generally speaking, only on administrative and practical matters that the Apostle thus appeals to the authority of Christ. When there is a dispute as to the right way to support the ministry, or when the relations of the sexes in the Church are under discussion, or when there is occasion to settle the order of the dispensation of the Lord's Supper, then the Apostle quotes Christ's words. A clear word of Christ in such a matter makes an end of all strife. And here, too, we may mention that the ethical teaching of the Apostle is very closely parallel to that of the Master and is manifestly based on it. He does not say that he is repeating Christ's instructions; and he does not reproduce them verbally; but they are present in all his discussions of matters of conduct. In such chapters as Rom. xii. or 1 Cor. xiii. or Col. iii. each precept of the Apostle can be connected with a precept of Christ, which it repeats and enforces. The Apostle, in fact, carried to the Gentiles the moral teaching of Christ, adapting it to their circumstances, and giving it the position of the supreme law of conduct in Gentile Christian communities.

On certain other very important sides of Christian thought, however, this is not found to be the case. While guided by the evangelical tradition in matters of practice, St. Paul refers to that tradition very little either with regard to the facts of the earthly life of Jesus or in connection with the view he formed of Christ's person and work.

With regard to the facts of the earthly life of Jesus it has always been felt to be a matter calling for explanation, that the Apostle of the Gentiles should say so very little about them. To us it appears a matter of course that one who takes Jesus for his Master should inform himself as

fully as possible as to what Jesus was and did when on earth. He should place himself under the influence of Jesus by learning about Him all that can be learned. The Gospel narrative should be the daily bread of his religious life. Of one who is to preach Christ to others this is still more to be required. Must not the events of the Saviour's life be the staple of the doctrine he is to preach? Is not his chief task to set forth Christ as he lived and moved, as he dealt with the wandering sheep, with the sick, with children, with sinners, with the sad and the neglected; as He taught His disciples, defended them against attacks, adjusted their differences, inspired them by His word and example to labour strenuously and bravely for his cause? How could a preacher discharge his task if he did not deal with these themes? What would a Christian minister be who had not the Gospels in his hands, and did not use them as his chief instruments of instruction?

Well, in the epistles of the Apostle Paul, and in his preaching, so far as his epistles reveal it to us, we find extremely little of all this. Though the Gospels were not written when he founded his churches, yet the tradition was in existence out of which the Gospels afterwards grew, not so advanced in form and arrangement as when St. Mark took it in hand to construct his Gospel out of it, but yet no doubt available if wanted for such missionary uses as we have spoken of. And St. Paul does use it, as we saw, where it is required for practical purposes. Yet, on the other hand, how little does he deal in the incidents of the Saviour's earthly career! If we depended on the Pauline Epistles for our knowledge of the life of Jesus in Palestine, how scantily should we be informed regarding it! We should know something of the views Christ took of duty in various relations, but of the incidents of His career how

little! That He was born a member of the Jewish race, that He instituted a ministry of the Word, composed at first of twelve persons, that He was crucified by the ruling powers of this world, killed by the Jewish nation, which afterwards persecuted His followers, that on the night on which he was delivered up to death He founded the Lord's Supper, that He rose again on the third day and was seen by such and such of His followers, and last of all by Paul himself: this we should learn. But the Apostle does not tell us anything about the Lord's journeys, nor does he mention any of the Gospel miracles, nor any of the encounters with the Scribes and Pharisees. When he speaks of the Sabbath he does not tell how the Lord excused the disregard of the day by His disciples; when he speaks of the use of meat offered to idols he does not cite the Lord's decisive verdict on the subject of purity, but reasons out the question from his own principles. We may say broadly that he does not deal in information about the Lord's life on earth. His Epistles do not enter into matters of that kind. If the Apostle's oral preaching was largely made up of such matter, as some scholars contend, the Epistles must have shown more traces of it than they do. Often as the writer refers to what he told his converts in his preaching, he does not appeal except in the instances cited above to narratives he had told them about Jesus.

This, at first sight, very curious observation is strikingly illustrated by a statement the Apostle makes as to the line of conduct he pursued after the great change of his conversion. After God had revealed His Son in him, he tells us (Galat. i. 16) that he might preach Him among the Gentiles, the first step he took was not to confer with any human beings, nor to go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before him. On the contrary, he went away

to Arabia. Only three years later did he go up to Jerusalem to make the acquaintance of Peter, a visit which lasted but a fortnight, and on which he saw no others of the apostles, with the exception of James, the Lord's brother. A convert naturally puts himself under instruction with those who can explain to him all the features of his new faith; a convert who feels himself set apart to a special work in his new faith will qualify himself for doing it by seeking the most efficient direction. If what was wanted for preaching to the Gentiles was full and accurate information about the Saviour's earthly life, then the Apostle Paul did not do this. The conclusion certainly suggests itself that he did not think this was what was most wanted. The earthly Jesus was not the being he was to preach to the Gentiles. As he had not been the personal disciple of Jesus, he could not preach the earthly Jesus in the same way that the older apostles could. Does it not appear that he did not consider this to be the function he was to fill in the Gospel cause?

So indeed it does appear when we find him saying to the Corinthians (1 Cor. ii. 2) that he had made up his mind when coming to Corinth not to know anything there but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. He says (2 Cor. v. 16) that he had once known Christ after the flesh, but had now come to know him no longer in that way. Whatever further meaning these texts contain, they certainly convey that he did not consider it his business to deal in reminiscences of the earthly Jesus, as the older apostles naturally did. He could supply so much of these traditions as was necessary for the organisation of his churches, and for their guidance in practical matters, but the principal message he had to deliver lay elsewhere.

This brings us to the point which this essay is intended

to bring out, that for the main part of his message, his view of Christ, the Apostle Paul was independent of the Gospel tradition. The Christ he preached was, in many important respects, a different being from the Jesus of the early tradition and of the Gospels. It was not from the Gospels, of course, for they did not then exist, but neither was it from the tradition out of which the Gospels arose, that the Apostle learned what he preached about Jesus Christ. His view of the nature and work of Christ was independent and original. He did not learn it from any human source, but believed it to have been divinely communicated to him. And we find on examining the matter that the Christ preached by Paul was in many respects a different being from the Christ preached by the older apostles and represented to us in the synoptic Gospels.

Two views of Christ were current in the early Church. This did not lead at that time to any controversy, because there was a great agreement on both sides as to the practical relation between Christ and His people, and the belief in His speedy return to the world made the question of His essential nature less important. The controversy was to break out afterwards; but in the apostolic age all the believers were agreed that Jesus was the Messiah and the Son of God, though this term has more than one meaning; that He had lived as a man, had taught as no one else had ever taught them human duty and pure religion, that He had risen from the dead after the crucifixion, that He was now with God, that He sent His Spirit to His followers, and enabled them to do wonderful works in His name, and that He was coming again shortly to judgment and an endless reign.

This belief about Christ was common to all Christians; but there were different views as to how Christ had attained

the position of Lord and Prince of Life, which all Christians believed Him to occupy.

To the older apostles the advance of Jesus to His heavenly dignity was a process they had themselves observed. They had known Him first as a man, they had been acquainted with His family circumstances and had His brothers still among them. They had seen Him not always successful or radiant, but subject to hunger and thirst and weariness, sometimes also disappointed and unable to accomplish what He tried to do. In spite of all this He had risen in their estimation till they regarded Him as destined to redeem Israel, and as indeed the Messiah, though not yet revealed in His true character. With this conviction they never parted: even the Crucifixion, rudely as it shook their Jewish hopes, did not uproot them. When they learned from the women of their company that their Master's grave was empty, and when the series of visions set in a few days afterwards proving the fact that He had risen as He said, they readily believed Him to be with God, sitting as Messiah at God's right hand, to come again when it pleased God, in His true character and aspect as Lord and Christ. Their Master had been a man when they first knew Him, but He had been exalted by God to a higher than human dignity, and was now to be spoken of as God's Son, living with God in heaven.

All this appears very plainly from the sermons of Peter in the earlier part of Acts, which no doubt represent to us very accurately the beliefs entertained in the Church in Palestine.

In Acts ii. 22 Peter says: "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs, ye, by the hands of lawless men, did crucify and

slay; whom God raised up, having loosed the pangs of death." Ver. 36: "Let all the house of Israel, therefore, know assuredly, that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified"; also ver. 30: "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom ye slew, hanging Him on a tree. Him did God exalt with (margin: at) His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins." Also see x. 37-42; xiii. 30-39; xvii. 31.

From these passages and others in Acts it appears that the view taken about Jesus in the early Church of Palestine was that He was originally a man, but that He had been raised by God to the honours of the Messiahship, and to what that might imply of divinity. On Jewish soil, the exaltation of Christ was necessarily subject to limitation. To the Jewish mind, God was an unapproachable being; no other divine being could be placed beside Him (John v. 18; vi. 42; vii. 27-33). That a person who had lived on the earth as a man should become God was to the Jew a blasphemous and impossible idea. Yet, an exception was possible. The figure of the Messiah, familiar at this time to Jewish thought, might furnish an approach to deity. Once let it be believed that a person was Messiah and he might rise high. It is through this means that the person of Jesus is exalted in the early preaching in the Acts. The attributes given Him are all such as to designate Him Messiah. "Anointed," "Prince," "Saviour," "Child," "Lord," all these titles said to have been given to Jesus by God, mark Him as the chosen representative, like the kings of old, of the chosen people. The early preachers in fact proclaimed Jesus as Messiah, and illustrated their meaning from the prophets, and from the current language of their day about that personage. If they did not at first

exalt Jesus beyond the measure possible to the Messiah as conceived by their generation, it is nothing wonderful. They were preaching to Israel, and speaking of the position their Master had come to occupy towards Israel. In Him the promises to the people of God were being fulfilled. "He is a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance to Israel and the remission of sins."

Thus, what the earlier apostles had to tell about Christ embraced firstly, the record of His life on earth, in which they had been His companions, and secondly, what had been conveyed to them through their visions and otherwise of His present heavenly dignity and of His coming to judge the world.

The Apostle Paul was in quite a different position from these first preachers of the risen Lord, and all the circumstances of his life and of his conversion to Christ combined to make his grasp of Christian truth different from theirs. We need not dwell on the fact that they were the unlearned and ignorant advocates of the cause, whilst he was its learned man, conversant with the highest thought of his age, and obliged when he became a Christian to harmonise his new faith with his old one, and to seek for a deeper view, one more satisfying to the intellect of his time, than they required. But the very fact that he had not, like them, known Christ as a man, placed him in a position to form a fresh view of what Christ really was, and of the object of His coming to the world. And lastly, there was the special call he felt himself to have received to a new field of labour for the Christian cause. The Gospel as the old apostles preached it, was suited for the mission they carried on in Jerusalem, and in the towns of Palestine. Addressed to the Jews, to those who had known something of the

human career of Jesus and who were living in the religion of the old covenant, the Gospel naturally took the form that the Jesus whom their rulers had delivered to the Cross was the Messiah of their race in whom the promises were fulfilled, and in whom, therefore, the Jews were bound to believe if they desired to have the promises fulfilled to them. But Paul was called to preach Christ, not to them, but to the Gentiles. In his mind the great thought had arisen that God could not intend the salvation He had provided in Christ to be for the benefit of the Jews alone, though it was fitting that it should first be preached to them, but that it was intended also for the nations, and that it was to be carried to the Greeks and barbarians.

This extension of the mission field necessarily implied that the Gospel should be clothed in a new form. Paul could not have accepted the call addressed to him by God to preach Christ to the Gentiles unless he had realised that it was possible to put the message before them in a way they would understand. He must have seen that the preaching which was effective in Jerusalem and in Palestine would be quite beside the mark if addressed to Greeks and barbarians. What could a Galatian or a Corinthian be expected to care about the Jewish Messiah? If he was already inclined to Judaism or had even joined the synagogue as a proselyte, the announcement that the Messiah had arrived might have some interest for him; but if people were to be converted who were worshipping the heathen gods, and to whom Judaism was indifferent, or, as was then very commonly the case, even distasteful, then the message must assume another form. If a person had come into the world who was to be a Saviour for them, and in whom they could be reasonably summoned to believe, it must be one of whom more could be asserted

than that he was the Messiah of the Jews. He must be one who stood nearer to themselves, and whom they could better understand. Paul proved himself the greatest of all the missionaries of the Church by the deep insight he showed into the position of those to whom he carried his message, and further proof of this will meet us as we proceed to examine that message itself.

Let us first see how it was first communicated to him.

Paul's personal knowledge of Jesus began with the vision which appeared to him on the road to Damascus. But the figure with which he became acquainted in that memorable hour was not a human figure, nor one subject to any human limitations or conditions. It was a heavenly being in whose presence he then found himself, a person all composed of light and brightness, not walking the earth but making himself visible from above, not subject to the laws of matter, but moving free in space; endowed also with a heavenly insight which could pierce through all disguises and excuses, and declare to a man the truth about himself and his past strivings. At that hour the knowledge of Jesus, as He truly was, against which he had long sought to fortify his mind, burst upon him with irresistible and ineffaceable conviction. In this way did it please God, the author of his being, to reveal His Son in him that he might preach Him to the Gentiles. In this way did He who first made light shine out of darkness, shine in the Apostle's heart to give him the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. And to this experience the Apostle afterwards appealed to show that his knowledge of Christ, though he had not been a follower of the Saviour on earth, was as real and substantial as that of the older apostles who had that advantage, and that the view he took of Christ's person and Christ's work was not

due to his own invention, but had been directly communicated to him by God. "I make known to you," he writes to the Galatians (i. 11), "touching the Gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man, for neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ." "Am I not an apostle?" he says to the Corinthians, "have I not seen Jesus, our Lord?" 1 Cor. ix. 1; and in chapter xv. of the same epistle, after enumerating the appearances of Christ to the various apostles and brethren, he goes on, ver. 8, to say, "and last of all, as unto one born out of due time, he appeared to me also." As his Christian career began with his vision, his vision provided also the basis of his teaching. It was the experience which he spent his life afterwards in interpreting and working out in all its consequences.

The Apostle's Christian career began, therefore, in quite a different manner from that of the twelve, and we cannot wonder if the views he was led to take up in isolation from his predecessors differed in many points from theirs. With regard to the views he took of Jesus Christ this is easily shown to be the case.

I. CHRIST WAS A PRE-EXISTENT DIVINE BEING

To the Apostle Paul the Saviour had existed before He came into the world to live the life of a man; He had existed as a divine being with God. This view of Christ's nature, which is not taught in the Synoptic Gospels, nor in the earliest preaching in Acts, is clearly stated by St. Paul in various passages which we shall quote. If we ask how he came to entertain such a belief, the answer must be that in the book of Enoch and other apocalyptic writings the

Messiah was regarded as a divine being whom God kept with Him in heaven to be manifested on earth when the proper moment should arrive.

Enoch xlvi. 1. And there I saw one Who had a head of days, and His head was white with wool, and with Him was another being (the Son of Man) whose countenance had the appearance of a man, and his face was full of graciousness like one of the holy angels, etc.

Enoch xlviii. 2. At that hour that Son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits. . . . 3. And before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of the heaven were made, His name was named before the Lord of Spirits. He will be a staff to the righteous on which they will support themselves and not fall, and He will be the light of the Gentiles and the hope of those who are troubled of heart. . . . 6. And for this reason has He been chosen and hidden before Him, before the creation of the world and for evermore.

4 Ezra xiii. 26. That is He whom the Highest has kept for length of days, through whom He is to redeem the creation.

The part of Enoch from which these quotations are made belongs to the early part of the century before Christ, and 4th Ezra is placed about 70 A.D. The view of the Messiah thus attested to us was one with which the Apostle Paul could not fail to be acquainted; that it helped him to define the nature of the person of Christ is an inference scarcely to be avoided. Once convinced that the Messiah had come in Jesus of Nazareth, that He had been raised from the dead and had appeared to him in his vision, the Apostle at once concluded that Jesus Messiah was a being of divine nature. The radiant form he saw in his vision was not that of any denizen of earth, it was a body of

glory and belonged to heaven. This glorious person was of heavenly origin. The Lord had dwelt with God before He was born on the earth as a man. Of the pre-existent state of Christ Paul has various things to tell us. While not equal with God, nor ambitious, as other heavenly beings perhaps were, of such equality, He shared the form or mode of being of God ; He was, that is to say, as when He appeared to the Apostle in vision, a radiant being, free to move above the earth, a Spirit capable, though without material human frame, of entering into communication with man, of understanding a man's thoughts and feelings, and of infusing into man in an unseen and undefined yet most real and effective way, encouragement and inspiration (*cf.* for example, 1 Cor. x. 4). But though superior to weak and burdened man, as being of a higher region, of a higher nature, He was essentially human. In Him a human being had dwelt in former times with God ; a being who could truly be called, like our first parent, Adam. This Adam was not of the earth or earthly ; He was a life-giving Spirit and a being of heavenly nature. In Him God had created the type of human nature at its best, one day to be realised in others of the race. "As we have borne the image of the earthy (of the man of earth), we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," 1 Cor. xv. 49. It has also to be noticed that this heavenly being who dwelt with God before He lived a human life on the earth, had to do with the work of creation. He was not Himself the Creator, since God the Father, Who alone is in the highest sense God, is the Creator of the world and of men ; but under God was the "Lord," who was God's agent in the work of creation, "Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and we through Him." 1 Cor. viii. 6.

We see then that to the Apostle Paul the history of the

Lord Jesus Christ begins much farther back than it does in any of the Synoptic Gospels. In the second Gospel that history begins with John the Baptist. In the first and third it begins with the announcement of the miraculous birth. With St. Paul it begins infinitely earlier. He knows nothing of the star seen by the wise men, nothing of the shepherds or the angels ; he knows nothing apparently of the virgin birth ; to him Jesus is not begotten of the Holy Ghost, but is Himself the life-giving Spirit, a divine being before He is " born of a woman, born under the law."

It is very clear how little the Apostle owed in connection with the view he took of Christ to the tradition which was deposited in our Gospels. It is also clear how admirably his doctrine of Christ was suited for the work of introducing the Saviour to the Gentiles. To the Jews it was difficult, as we saw, to conceive how one who had lived on earth as a man could yet be divine. When the Jews came to think of beings intermediate between God and man, to bridge the chasm between them, they did not think of a divine man or of a human God, but they distinguished from God some one of His own attributes, such as Wisdom, or the Glory, or the Word, and made it the mediator. To the Greeks and Romans, on the contrary, the idea of a god who assumed human form and lived a human life was quite familiar, and their literatures afford many instances of it. When Paul preached Christ to them as a divine being who had come down from heaven to be a man, there was nothing revolting to them in the thought. Providence we may say had prepared the way in their minds for the doctrine of the pre-existent divinity of Christ ; and it was to them that that doctrine was first addressed. The Christ preached to them by St. Paul was not a man who had risen

through the Messiahship to sit at God's right hand, but a being, who, after dwelling in exalted heavenly station, consented from pure love to men to make an entire renunciation of all His native rank and splendour, and to live a life of obedience and submission that men might be saved. "God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, to redeem them that were under the law that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. iv. 4. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, though He was rich, yet for your sake He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich." 2 Cor. viii. 9. "Being in the form of God He thought it not a thing to grasp at to be equal with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men." Phil. ii. 6, 7. In these and other passages of the Pauline Epistles we see the transformation of the Messiah of the Jews into the Son of God, who belongs to no nation but to mankind, and could accordingly be preached to all the nations as one who cared for them, and in whose love God ordained that they should have a share.

II. CHRIST IS THE SPIRIT

2 Cor. iii. 17, we read: "Now the Lord is the Spirit." And (1 Cor. xv. 45) it is said that the last Adam, the higher heavenly type of humanity is a life-giving Spirit. We have seen what the Apostle considered Christ to have been in His origin. In these expressions we learn what he considers Christ to be now, in His essence and in His operations.

This view also may be traced with some confidence to the Apostle's experience at his conversion. He then came in contact with a being who, without any material instru-

ment, was able to produce the most powerful effect on his thoughts and intentions, and from that influence he never became free again. During his whole life afterwards Christ was with him everywhere, a guiding, warning, inspiring, comforting, all-powerful presence, so that he spoke of himself as being in Christ, of his life as being not his own life, but Christ living in him. He begins his epistles with a description of himself as Christ's slave and bondservant. Christ is able to do everything in him and through him ; His grace is sufficient for His servant even in the most distressing situations and in presence of the direst perils. There is small need then to go back to the Master's earthly career for instruction about Him when the Master is so constantly with His servant and directs him so uninterruptedly. The Apostle's knowledge of Christ is so immediate, so enveloping, so intimate that he is independent of other kinds of knowledge about Him. He does not need to speak of his Master in the past because he can speak of Him confidently in the present, and feels so constantly all that He is and all that He enjoins.

But what was true in his own case as an individual, the Apostle considered to be true also on a larger scale of all believers and of the Church. Christ was not only the foundation on which the Church was built ; He was its living present head, looking to whom all its members were one, and from whom each derived the impulse and the direction he needed to perform his part in the Church effectively. His inspiration acted on all of them. To us Christ and the Spirit are distinct persons, but to the Apostle this was scarcely the case. That a man should have the Spirit of Christ in him was the same thing to him as that he should have Christ in him, or that he should

have the Spirit of God in him. Rom. viii. 9-11. It was indispensable that every Christian should know Christ in this way as the Spirit, and should place himself at the Lord's disposal, both his body and the workings of his mind.

How the Spirit acted in the early Christian communities is well known—some of the manifestations of its power appear very strange to us. The inspiration acted upon all, but prompted each to a special activity. One spoke in a tongue another interpreted the tongue, another prophesied or declared the will of God for the community or for the cause, one served the Church in business matters, another gave himself up to the work of healing. So Christ acted in the members of the Church; in this way they knew Him and experienced His power. But in their ordinary life also the Spirit was to be known to them. They were to walk in the Spirit always, and under that inspiration to keep constantly offering that sacrifice of self-control and self-surrender which the Christian is never to forget. Walking in the Spirit they were to find that the law had nothing to say to them, that they were borne forward on a course in which they not only gladly avoided the grosser sins, but were kept free from conceit and intellectual arrogance and all the forms of self-seeking which interfere with social co-operation.

Thus did the Corinthians and Galatians know Christ. They were baptised, dipped into Him at their conversion, and thus it could be said of them also that they were in Christ, and that Christ was in them. From the very beginning of their Christian life they experienced His energy. His Spirit, He Himself, active and inspiring, came to them at once and impelled them to the service they were fit to do for His cause. Of them, as of the Apostle

himself it must have been true that this immediate experience of the Spirit of Christ made it less imperative to collect the details of His earthly career and dwell on them. And here also we may notice that the form of religion we have described was not unknown on Gentile soil. The Greek world knew at this time many a cult in which the deity was held to take possession of His worshippers, and to urge them by an inner impulse to all that His service required. If Greek religion was poor in moral guidance it was strong on the side of sympathetic inspiration. It inclined less to the collecting and keeping of commandments, more to possession by a deity. In this aspect also the religion of Greece was a preparation for Christ.

III. WITH ST. PAUL CHRIST'S DEATH HAS EFFECTED THE ATONEMENT BETWEEN MAN AND GOD; AND THIS WAS THE OBJECT OF HIS COMING INTO THE WORLD

In the Synoptic Gospels, as every reader of the New Testament is aware, there is little direct teaching about the meaning of the death of Christ; some of His own sayings on the subject are recorded, though without comment, but the evangelists do not deal with it themselves. It is a matter they apparently do not feel themselves called to enter upon, a mystery to which they do not feel that they possess the key. In this they no doubt truly reflect the state of mind of the older apostles and of the churches in which the Gospel tradition was preserved. The sermons reported in Acts give no full explanation of the meaning of Christ's death. It is there treated as a mysterious and dreadful event which God had permitted and ordained, but from which the believer may turn without seeking fully to

understand it, to the glories and triumphs of the Saviour's second coming.

With the Apostle Paul this is very different. It is from his epistles that the Church has learned the meaning of the Cross. In preaching to the Gentiles he made the Cross of Christ his principal subject. To the Galatians Jesus Christ was openly set forth crucified ; out of that declaration their Christian life with all its beliefs and activities arose. (Galatians iii. 1-5.) When he first came to Corinth the Apostle determined to deal with no other subject in his preaching there but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. "God forbid that I should glory," he says, "save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." To him he felt it had been given to understand what had been effected in the Cross for man's salvation. The death of Christ was the cardinal fact about the Lord, the object of His coming to the world, the great achievement by which He became the Saviour of men, the act which, far more than any other, gave interest and meaning to his whole career.

Here, too, St. Paul proved himself the true Apostle of the Gentiles. By his vivid and intense appreciation of the sacrifice of Christ, His infinite condescension, the beauty of His willing self-surrender to the extremity of suffering, he struck a note to which the hearts of all men could respond, and which continues to this day the dominant note of all Christian thought and feeling. In this there is no doubt that he was following out the intimations Jesus Himself had given as to the meaning and purpose of His death, when He said He had come to give His life as a ransom for many, and that His blood was shed for many for the remission of sins. If, as Paul felt in his own experience, peace and forgiveness had descended on the vexed and troubled conscience when it turned in faith to

Jesus Christ, he readily concluded that the bringing of that peace to men had been the object of the Saviour's coming. The glorious being who had lived with God in heaven had come down from heaven out of pure love for sinful men, to present the sacrifice without which it appeared that sin could not be forgiven nor the kingdom of God thrown open. Being rich He became poor for our sake, that we, through His poverty, might be rich. Being formed in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, yea, the death of the Cross. All those who were waiting at the gate of the kingdom and were enjoying already in anticipation its treasures and its glories, owed this to the act of Christ in dying for them. How profound should be their gratitude to the divine Being who left the heavens for them, and for their sake made so infinite and tragic a sacrifice. This is a theme of which the Apostle never wearies. "You are not your own," he says, "you are bought with a price." "The love of Christ constrains me." "The love of Christ which passeth knowledge."

In this way does the Apostle speak of the act which the Redeemer accomplished for men as the crown of His life on earth. But he also speaks of the death of Christ in another way, not as an act done in the past which has produced a certain result in men's relation with God, but as an act which still goes on, and in which the believer himself is to take a part. As Christ is a Divine Being, His acts and experiences do not come to an end when once accomplished in history; Christ is for ever crucified, for ever rising from the dead, and he who unites himself with Christ dies with Him, rises with Him, not once only, as in baptism, but in an experience which is constantly renewed. The dying of the Lord Jesus is a thing the Christian carries about with

him, not only when sorrows and afflictions lend a present reality to the suggestion, but at all times. The life of the Christian is a daily dying. He fills up that which is lacking of the sufferings of Christ. And, on the other hand, Christ's rising from the dead is not only an action in the past; it too still goes on. The believer sees in Christ's death his own death, in Christ's rising from the grave both his own rising now above all sin and worldliness, and the promise of his final resurrection, the power to accomplish which is already at work within him.

Here also we may observe how the Gentile world was prepared to receive such a Gospel as St. Paul preached. That world was acquainted in the Apostle's time with many a cult in which a god was worshipped who had died and returned to life again, and in which the worshippers plunged themselves sympathetically into the experience of the deity, mourning at his death and disappearance, exulting at his reappearance, and surrendering themselves in glad enthusiasm to the spirit he breathed into them. Many of these cults came from the East, as those of Dionysus and of Attis; and they were generally connected with the revival of life on the earth after its winter slumber. This type of religion was specially prevalent in Asia Minor, and the Apostle must have known about it. The rites belonging to it were no doubt in many cases barbarous, the inspiration it afforded was only occasional, and came far short of being a guide for the whole of life, as is the Christian's self-identification with the Saviour. Those who were acquainted with the cult of Dionysus or of Zagreus would recognise in the religion Paul preached to them a higher form of a worship they already knew, only that in this case the God was a very different being, and His service one leading them to a very different con-

versation. They knew from their past experience what it meant to be baptised into Christ's death, to put on Christ, to be in His Spirit. To walk in His Spirit, that certainly was new to them.

[On this subject the reader may consult Professor Ramsay's article on "The Religion of Greece and Asia Minor," in vol. v. of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*; where he will find references to recent literature. See also, "The Letters to the Seven Churches," by the same writer.]

What the Apostle Paul believed as to the person of the Saviour is what, broadly speaking, we all believe. We think of Christ not as a man who lived long ago, but as a present, ever-living Lord, who is with His people to the end of the world, who does not belong to any nation, but is the desire of all nations, who acts in the hearts and lives of His people, in whose Cross they find deliverance from sin and evil, in whose triumph over the grave they know that for them, too, death has lost its sting. It is thus that Christ abides with us. The sense of forgiveness and peace, of triumph and victory, of a light shining on us from heaven which will never pass away, we still enjoy. If in Paul's case it was the experience that all his questions were solved in Christ, that his struggle was over, his darkness past, that he could come freely to God without any sacrifice in his hand or any distortion of his nature, as a child to its father; if this was what made him so sure that the Son of God had come into the world, and that what the Son of God had proved to be for Him He was able and willing to be for all men, then we stand where the Apostle stood; his faith is also ours.

It is true that that faith is not based on the Synoptic Gospels. St. Paul did not derive his doctrine of Christ

from the older apostles, and similarly it is not from Matthew or Mark or Luke that we learn about the Saviour's pre-existence, or about His being the archetype of humanity or about His having come into the world specially in order to be crucified. It is a figure of a different kind that these great books present to us; the figure of a man whose life was full of good works, and to whom the Holy Spirit was given without measure, who claimed to be the Messiah of the Jews, and came to His death in consequence of that claim. In outward features the Christ of the Gospels and the Christ of St. Paul are widely different; it is evident at once that neither are the Gospels under the influence of the Apostle in the description they give of the Lord, nor can Paul be thought to have derived his doctrine of Christ from the Gospel tradition. The two are independent of each other. It is only to a deeper view that the unity of the two appears. Despite the wide difference in externals and in detail, the spirit of the Saviour is the same in both cases, the same message is spoken to the soul, the believer is brought into the same position towards God and towards man. The narratives in the Synoptic Gospels place One before us, who, while acting as a man, infuses into us the same assurances as are spoken by the Heavenly Being whom Paul saw, who tells us in powerful accents of forgiveness, of peace, of disorder yielding to sanity and hopefulness, of struggle issuing in calm, of the breaking of fetters, of the bringing of liberty to the captive, of the nearness and the goodness of God, and of the urgent necessity laid upon us of serving God with all our power, and doing for our neighbours all we can. Whether we learn Christ from the Gospels or from the Apostle Paul, it is thus that we come to know Him. By whatever road we come to Him, we

find Him the obedient Son who by devoting Himself without any reserve to be the instrument of God's will achieves both for Himself and for others a victory over sin and sorrow, and even over death, which could in no other way have been achieved. He is the Son of God through whom God has infused into mankind a new vigour nothing can conquer, in whom man has become possessed afresh of that chief treasure of his life which includes all others, the knowledge and the love of God.

If it is true that Christ may be known from other sources than the Gospels, then the Christian is to some extent independent of these great works, and need not fear when criticism appears to deal with them too roughly, that he is about to suffer any vital injury. To the Apostle Paul it must have been a matter of indifference how the tradition of the life of Jesus shaped itself in Palestine, what signs heralded His birth, whether the Sermon on the Mount was spoken on a mount or on a plain, whether the Beatitudes were four or eight in number, whether the Lord's Prayer had five or six or seven petitions, or how the various narratives of the resurrection could be adjusted into one. His faith in Christ did not depend on any such matters as these. And have not we also some knowledge of Christ of which we may say in a fashion that we did not receive it from man? Do we not know Christ by His Spirit as it speaks to our hearts, and as it produces its mighty works in the Church and in society? Do we require a book to tell us in what direction we must turn to follow Christ? Have not our home training, our church life, our Christian art, our best literature, our charitable work, our love of freedom and abhorrence of slavery both for ourselves and for our fellowmen, and all the ideals

which we cherish, made us know what Christ is? Are we not sure that the Being who came into the world to live and to die for us, who appeals so strongly to the heart and the conscience of mankind, who taught us what God is and what we are, to whom all that is highest in our nature and our civilisation responds so naturally, are we not sure that God sent Him to us, that He is God's well-beloved Son, and that our salvation consists in living and dying with Him, in Him? If such a faith be ours, then even if it should appear quite impossible to know Christ in His human life, "after the flesh," yet we are not forsaken, since the Lord, who is the spirit, is with us always.

Such a faith, it may be said, is vague and indefinite, incapable of verification, subjective, personal. The facts to which it appeals admit of various interpretations; it may convince the heart which is already disposed to cherish it, it cannot convince those who are not inclined to it. To such criticism as this there is no doubt the Apostle Paul was himself subjected. We know that the vision on which he relied was turned against him, that there were those who doubted whether Christ really spoke through him, or whether his doctrine of Christ crucified was any legitimate part of Christian belief. Even in his own churches reaction took place against his too spiritual teaching, and in favour of the apostles who had known the Lord and could communicate living memories of His acts and words. And if we can command some knowledge of the facts of the Lord's life on earth, there will always be a disposition to give these facts a high place in Christian teaching, and to think that by tracing His steps when He lived on the earth as a man, and hearing the words He spoke we come nearer to Him than any doctrine about Him can possibly bring us. To ask us to accept such a doctrine of Christ as

that of St. Paul, and to be content with the Divine Person thus brought before us is to ask us to do without the Man Jesus Christ, and to restrict ourselves to the divine side of His person. But the human nature of Christ we all feel is a matter of infinite value to us. We are not entitled to lose sight of it even for the sake of the divine figure St. Paul places before us. To do so would be to endanger the historical reality of our religion, recklessly to throw away that part of it which men in general understand most easily and feel most strongly to be a living message to their soul. By all means, therefore, it is necessary that we should study the Gospels and earnestly endeavour to find out the facts they really contain. Those who were apostles before St. Paul have a right to be heard in what they record as to the Master's life on earth, as well as Paul himself in what he tells us of Christ as a Divine Being. The examination of the Gospels must go on; not only of the Gospel of John, in which the earthly Christ is a divine being, but of the Synoptic Gospels also, which tell us of Jesus, not only in His acts of power, but also in His human strivings and limitations, and in his workday reality as our own brother, who thought and suffered and was tempted like ourselves.

Both sides are necessary to us. We require to be assured that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh; if He was not a man like ourselves He cannot be a Saviour for us; and if we were guided entirely by the Apostle Paul's view of His nature we might think this doubtful. To make sure of His human nature it is necessary that criticism should be allowed to carry on its work on the Gospels, and that the real facts of the life of Christ and of His teaching should be brought to light, if we do not yet know them. After all there is much in the Gospels which criticism, if

experience up to this time be any guide, will not destroy, but only establish. It can never be maintained that Providence has given us in our four Gospels a complete and accurate journal of the Lord's life, or a verbal reproduction of His doctrine. The mere fact that these works are not one, but four, and that they differ from each other on every page, makes this out of the question and sets before criticism a task it cannot refuse to take in hand. But there are some things in the Gospels which the long battle of criticism has not dislodged, but has rather made more sure; and these are the things which, perhaps, one may say are the most important of all for the Christian to know. The character of Jesus stands sure, whatever may be found out as to the Gospels; His life of prayer, His unfailing enthusiasm for the work He felt God had called Him to do, His certainty that that work would stand; His passion for helping His brethren, His calm superiority to all the forms of evil and darkness, His truthfulness, His courage, His tenderness to the suffering and the weak; these things no criticism has assailed. That He succeeded where we all so sorrowfully fail, in living in unbroken submission to God, and in being in all His acts and words a ready instrument of the Divine will; this we may confidently hold. Nor are the main outlines of the Lord's teaching at all doubtful. It is, it is true, not possible to put together any verbatim report of what He said, and as to many of the sayings no final decision can be arrived at regarding their original intention. But the kind of life enforced is quite plain. The Epistles set it forth as well as the Gospels, and it is illustrated by the life and conduct of Christ Himself; it speaks through all His actions and from the exalted position of the Cross. Take them all in all, while the Gospels do not present us with any hard and fast directory of belief

or conduct, but rather with an example and a set of suggestions, they leave us in no uncertainty what kind of man the Lord was, or what is implied in following Him.

Of course, we want more than this. No interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels, however faithful and sympathetic, will afford to us an adequate expression of what we know Christ to have done for us and for the world, or sum up the love and gratitude and wonder we feel towards Him. We begin with the Gospels, but we cannot end with them in our enquiry as to His nature and His position. What must that person be to God, we cannot but enquire; what must He be to mankind, in whom and through whom, after so many imperfect and unsatisfying religions had shed their partial light upon the world, the true and full and adequate religion has arrived upon this planet; the religion of reconciliation and peace with God, the religion of human freedom and of illimitable hope, the religion of self-surrender and of gentleness and love? The Apostle Paul was the first to endeavour to answer this great question. We have seen what answer he returned to it. His answer proved the starting point of centuries of debate, in which the Church sought to define as accurately and fully as possible the nature of Christ. This essay has been written to suggest that we may reasonably take the first step at least of that great inquiry along with the Apostle Paul, and that if we do so, the debates which are carried on about the Gospels will not be felt to threaten our faith in Christ and need not so much distress us. Is it not allowable, reasonable and natural for us, knowing what we do of Christ, to say with the Apostle: "When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of

sons," and "The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that One died for all, therefore all died; and He died for all that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him, who for their sakes died and rose again."

III

CHRISTOLOGICAL STUDIES

I

THE ART OF THE PARABLES[1]

THE recent attacks on the historicity of Jesus did not perhaps occasion serious alarm to sober students of the New Testament. They taught us that there is much in the Gospel records which cannot be accepted as fact, but also that there is a good deal that can be so accepted, and that we know perhaps as much about Jesus as we could expect to know about the founder of a new religion in a distant country and age. That we have four accounts of His life and teaching and not only one, is a thing to be accepted with thankfulness. The work of detailed criticism which is involved in connexion with the Gospels brings home to us that no life of Jesus can ever attain dogmatic authority for the Christian Church ; these books can never be used as a creed, they differ so much from each other. But, on the other hand, the same work of criticism proves that the Gospels contain a large amount of information about Jesus which may be accepted undoubtingly, and placed Him before us as a historical figure, belonging to a certain place and an ascertained time, engaged in preaching

[1] This paper is reprinted by kind permission of the Editor of the *Expositor*, in which it appeared in July, 1915.

and in the treatment of the sick and mentally distressed, leading a band of followers about the country who took up His cause after He was crucified. And a great deal of His preaching is recorded for us, so that we know the theme of it, and the point of view, and the motives which guided this preacher and led Him to His tragical end.

The late attacks on the historicity of Jesus have ceased to alarm. No doubt they will be renewed again and again, that the critic may not fall asleep, but be kept to his task of making out how much we can claim as actually known about Jesus. But we must also diligently apply the knowledge we undoubtedly have about Jesus and seek by means of it to build up His figure in our minds and to make Him real to ourselves in His character and His modes of action. How many different lines of study this implies hardly needs to be pointed out. There is the study of the stage on which He moved, of what He saw spread around Him, of the various systems of laws with which He came in contact, Mosaic, Rabbinic, Roman; there is the study of the mental disorders with which He undertook to deal, the study of the various sets of people he encountered, Pharisees, lawyers, the pious, the ascetics; there is the traditional morality of His day, and of the views of the future which laid so strong a hand on His generation. And there is the psychological study of Jesus Himself, His original character and tendency of mind, His native likings and dislikes, His way of looking out on His fellow-creatures and on the world around Him and on God; how far these views were inherited and how far original in Him, as they grew up in His mind. The labours of a generation in all these fields of enquiry will not suffice to complete our knowledge of Jesus as a man, and will only lead us to the threshold of the question which science as well as

doctrine must one day take up, how far He must be regarded as more than man. The enquiry will never cease to compel our attention.

A humble suggestion follows this ambitious exordium, but makes in the direction it indicates. The parables of the Synoptic Gospels are regarded by leading scholars as the most authentic part of the teaching of Jesus which we have. Hardly any of them can be understood except as spoken by Him. In the parables we most surely find Him. What do they tell us of Him? They have been little studied from this point of view. Mr. Murray's very fresh and interesting book *Jesus and His Parables* seeks more to understand the stories they put before us than to make out how they suggested themselves to Jesus' mind and what they tell us of Him. And the same is true of Jülicher's great book and generally of the great mass of literature that has been produced on the subject. But here surely if anywhere we have much of the inner experience and history of Jesus and are led to see the outlook He had on the world and on men, and to apprehend the attitude of mind in which He must have placed Himself or been placed in order to arrive at such a position towards all that He saw and heard. In the parables if anywhere we find the eye of Jesus as it was bent on the world, and draw near to the centre of His heart and mind as He questioned the world in which He found Himself. In them, if we have skill—to which I make no pretension —we may most surely grasp the mind, the genius of Jesus.

And then another point, the work of composition of which the parables were the product. The work tells of its master. When we find a work that is finely conceived

and vigorously executed, we may certainly draw conclusions as to the character and disposition of the person who made it. That is true whether the work be a great church covered within and without with carved figures and scrolls, or a piece of delicate designing in gold and silver, or the songs of a poet, or the stories of a writer of romance. By examining carefully any such work we may arrive at well-grounded conclusions about not only the generation that produced them, but the person who did so, and may judge of his knowledge, his skill, his patience and application, and the aims he had before his mind in the work he did.

What do the parables tell us of the mind which produced them? They tell us in the first place that it was a mind powerfully interested in the human beings who came under its observation. He observed them acutely and saw them in the actions which were characteristic of them, and He was able to penetrate under the surface of their actions and to discern why they did them, and what hopes and fears were present to their minds. There is nothing fanciful or novel in the subjects of the parables. Jesus never tells us about beasts that talk, or about caves full of treasure under the sea, or about flying carpets or magic watchwords. His subjects are all such as are met with in ordinary human life, and the people He brings before us are not exceptional for power, nor for goodness, nor yet for badness, they are ordinary specimens of the human race, such as might be met with every day in Galilee and may be met with still in England or Scotland. There is no lengthy description to introduce the characters in the story; there is no need of it, the actor is well known, he is just an ordinary person plying his accustomed calling in the next field or the next house, or down on the seashore. There

were hundreds of sowers who went forth to sow in Galilee, and the story Jesus tells about a sower would be true of any of them; there were scores of fishers on the lake, scores of shepherds on the high ground; no need to give this one a name or any special introduction. The same of the woman who lost one of her ten shillings, of the farmer who lost his son and got him back again. They are not in themselves anyway remarkable or distinguished; they are not heroes, they are not bad people, they are just the ordinary, and we would say commonplace, humanity of the country.

What lays hold of us in the parables is not anything outstanding in the people about whom they are told, but the way in which Jesus understands these common people. They provide Him with His natural expression for all He has to teach. They live before us so really and vividly that each of them can be made into a picture, like the sower or the gleaners of Millet. They live before us because Jesus observed them with such penetrating eyes and saw what each of them was aiming at, hoping and fearing. In each parable we have the picture of a soul, we are able to see the motive which seized upon that soul in a particular situation, and how it sprang into activity (parable of the hidden treasure), or shrank from exertion (parable of the two sons) or found excuses for not acting at all, though the circumstances called for it.

This tells us something about Jesus Himself, which we may put down as beyond doubt proved with regard to Him. He had a great gift of observation, and the subject to which His observation was firstly and chiefly directed was the lives of men and the ways in which men act. The whole life of the country was an open book to Him, He understood the whole of what went on in it. He was

keenly interested in His fellow-creatures; He saw not only the outer figure of the sower as he goes out to sow his seed; He looked into his soul, and saw the fears and anxieties, many and persistent, on this side and on that, which accompanied his apparently easy task and made him a type of the prophet going forth to prepare his people for God's coming to them. He saw the woman in her dark and dusty house, sweeping till she found the piece she had lost and marked the transition in her soul from despair to joy that called for sympathy; so, He judged, do God and His angels rejoice when the sinner turns from his evil way. He saw the woman coming to the judge day after day, despairing of redress and yet refusing to despair, and stepping nearer and nearer to the judge each day she came back to him, till he was frightened at her or shamed into attending to her. He watched the two groups of children in the market place of some town, one group serious and bent on doing something and trying to get the others to enter into their idea, the other group indifferent and lazy, not taking any interest in anything proposed to them. All these little histories of common life He saw, penetrating in each case to the feeling, the motive from which the action sprang on this side and on that, so that things which to others were ordinary and trivial and not worth noticing, were to Him full of interest and revealed the profound differences of character which make one man act thus, another thus. Men of every walk of life and of every occupation passed before His eye and each left on His mind a deep impression. Master and servant, owner and steward and day labourer, king and beggar, creditor and debtor, loser and finder, tender and selfish, humane and inhumane; He saw them all and was indifferent to none of them, so much so that life in Galilee stands before

us still by His keen observation and gift of just and true expression just as it was lived in Jesus' day, and His parables are the principal source of our knowledge of it, and bring before us as if we saw them the actions and the mistakes, the difficulties and scruples, the ordinary domestic processes and the adventurous resolves of that long dead generation in Galilee.

The parables, then, tell us of the consummate knowledge Jesus possessed of the men and women around Him. Their ordinary joys and sorrows were very real to Him. He entered into the spirit of their weddings and their banquets, their housebuilding, their farming and shepherding and vine-growing. He knew how a father grieved when his son left him and wandered away into the world, and how overflowing and extravagant his joy could be when the son came home to him. It all lay plain and clear before His mind. We know that He is telling us about real people and real experiences; we know that He, who tells us such stories, is Himself a real person. The parables are a strong enough foundation to bear of themselves the proof of the historicity of Jesus, even though there were no other argument for it.

But granted Jesus had consummate knowledge of His fellow-countrymen, what then? Another might have known as much; no doubt many others thought they did know as much as Jesus did of the ways and manners of the common people. There was nothing new in it; they had known it all their lives. But then they did not make the parables out of the knowledge they fancied they possessed, and Jesus did. The thoughts of Burns were not new to his contemporaries; but they did not write the songs of Burns; the poet only did that. So the knowledge Jesus had of His fellow-men was constantly being turned into

stories from His lips, such stories that no one who had heard one of them could ever forget it. Jesus, in fact, is a great artist; He is always producing stories, and stories which are alive and talk to you long after you have heard them, and are as full of life and reality to-day as when they were first uttered. He has a great gift of creation; the materials He deals with are common enough, but He never forgets what He once observed; whatever is spoken of, He is ready with a living and telling illustration of it taken from the thoughts and habits of the common people. He turns His ordinary materials into jewels that shine and sparkle in your eyes and compel you to think what He means. It is true, you must confess, people do act in that way; the shepherd does go out to the wilderness after the sheep that has strayed, the pearl merchant will sell all he has to buy the noble pearl; what does He mean us to gather out of the simple and true little story? The arrow is well formed, well aimed; it finds its mark. The hearer turns the story over and over in his mind, till he gets the right light on it, the light with which Jesus meant it to shine.

Jesus must have been very entertaining as a preacher. All His talk is about real things and real people, He never spoke, Mark tells us (iii. 33) but He came out with such parables. So He never wearied His audience. How often do we read of the multitudes that thronged about Him to hear His talk! He never was abstruse or difficult, as so many a preacher is, even with Jesus as his pattern; He made no long introductions or elaborate arguments. He told a story or two and left it to you to find out what He meant it to convey. You could do that He said; "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Taken in connexion with His central theme, that God

was coming to rule and with the figure of Jesus as His Messenger, the meaning of His parable would soon grow plain.

One thing more let me say about Jesus as a teller of stories. His parables must have been a pleasure to Him both in the making and the telling. There is no pleasure so great that is open to mortals as that of making something that is good. Best of all the hours that make up our lives are those in which a man has produced something he will never be ashamed of. Even though it should be known and seen by few, though it should seem to pass away and mingle with the work of other men, so that its maker's name is lost, still the pleasure which accompanied its birth will last. And Jesus must have known this pleasure. When He fetched out of the great gallery of all He had witnessed and remembered, an incident, a story, a parable that exactly fitted the discussion He had in hand, and in an instant placed it in the true light, can we conceive that that gave Him no satisfaction? Could he produce those unforgettable narratives of the seed growing secretly, of the barren fig-tree, of the ten virgins, without His pulse quickening at the thought that that was done as it ought to be, that that story was well made, that it would stand? No doubt He would at once ascribe to God all the praise and glory for what had been done, as we find Him doing in a passage (Luke x. 21) where not the parables, but the whole tenor of His teaching was in question ; yet as there, He would exult in spirit, the exercise of His gift could not but comfort Him and yield to Him, in face of whatever sorrows and disappointments, a great and noble pleasure.

We may not think, however, that He dwelt much, if at all, on the pleasure which the exercise of His gift afforded

Him, still less that He made the parables for the sake of the pleasure they would yield Him. He was an artist certainly, but not in that way. He knew that He had not come into the world to please Himself, but to glorify God and serve Him. God had given Him a work to do, and He gave Himself to that work with all His heart. It was by preaching that that work was to be accomplished (Mark i. 38, 39, Luke iv. 18, *passim* in the Synoptists). He preached in parables, but the parables given to Him for such a work He could not regard as toys given to Him for His own satisfaction; rather as weapons, we should say, put in His hand by God, to smite those who opposed God, to clear away obstacles which lay in the way of God's purpose, to defend God's people from hard taskmasters. We shall say that it gave Him pleasure to produce the parables, as it is a joy to every artist to create works which will rejoice the hearer and the beholder, but that He did not think much of the pleasure they gave Him, and thought more of the truth the parable was to teach than of the illustration.

To sum up this discussion. The parables tell us a great deal about the person of Jesus Christ. If they were not produced supernaturally, a claim which so far as I know has never been formally made for them, but in the ordinary way of artistic preparation—collection of materials, consideration of the materials collected, the arrangement of them round some central point or theme—if the parables came into existence in this way, they tell us much of their Author, both as a collector of material to be used afterward for stories, and as a narrator of stories. We have seen that Jesus took a great interest in his fellow-men, observed them keenly and saw the motives of their actions. Even obscure and commonplace people were of the greatest

interest to Him, and He cared not only for the good but for the erring, not only for the successful but also for the failures of His neighbourhood. May we not say that He loved those people whom He sketches for us so thoroughly and truthfully? If He understood them so completely, could He fail to love them? And if He died for men, did He not know very well for what kind of people He was dying?

And if they teach us this of the heart that was concerned in the collection and preparation of the materials, do not the parables teach us also much of the mind that put together the several stories out of such materials, and produced them so boldly, and with such a power of conviction? In His teaching everything is thoroughly judged and prepared. He waits till He has His story quite ready and sends it forth rounded and complete, so that no one can help listening to it and no one can forget it.

"Truth embodied in a tale
Will enter in through lowly doors."

And there is little that is abstract, little that is anyway hard in His teaching. And there is nothing dogmatic in it, nothing to rouse gainsaying. A parable cannot be contradicted, can scarcely be criticised. And yet so much can be conveyed in it, such terrifying anticipations and heart-searching accusations; and, on the other hand, such gentle assurances of God's presence in the world, such encouragements to wait His time. Here, too, in the matter of the use Jesus made of the parables, we have much about Him that no ingenuity can take away from us. He was a consummate teacher who knew well the secret of access to the human heart and mind. His means were adequate, His methods right. He knew how to supply a

story rather than a doctrine, the doctrine being no doubt present in the story, but everything rough and angular taken away from it. The simple heart feels itself called to the Gospels rather than to Paul; there it finds a greater Teacher, a profounder Gospel.

II

THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY[1]

To many good Christians it may, no doubt, appear to be an impertinence to ask what is the essence of their religion. They are living in it, and know the help it brings them, and they see no reason to enter on an inquiry, the result of which may prove unsettling. And it may be thankfully acknowledged that, even when we are suffering from religious perplexity, there are ways in which we may assure ourselves of the vital truth of our religion without waiting till all our perplexities are solved. To make sure that we are in contact with the realities of our faith, and are not unwarrantably sheltering ourselves under its name, we have only to go to church and enter heartily into the simple actions which are done there. The rites of Christianity are older than its doctrines; and when we identify ourselves with the Christian congregation, we are "in the current." Even should we not understand the doctrine, or should we find it inadequate to our experience and our hopes, we yet find Christ, who is present wherever two or three are gathered together in His name, when we look upon the faces of our fellow-worshippers, and join with them in praise and prayer. Again, when we join in the good works which are part, at least, of the Church's

[1] This paper appeared in the *Contemporary Review* of April, 1896, and is reprinted here with the kind permission of the Editor.

liturgy, we approach most really and truly the essence of the faith.

There can be no doubt, however, that most Christians desire not only to practise the actions belonging to their religion, but also to understand why they do so. Every one has some kind of theory of religion, and there are, perhaps, few who are not anxious to be assured that the theory they hold on this matter is a true one. What is Christianity; what is the central truth of it; does the practice of the religion correspond with the ideal of it, or is the ideal very much higher and better? What does Christianity require us to believe, to do, to aim at? What is the gist of the matter, and who is the true Christian? These questions are incessantly being put, consciously or unconsciously, wherever there is any living thought and active conscience as to the things of Christ. The preacher has constantly to ask himself what ought to be put in the forefront of his message; the missionary has to ask himself still more anxiously the same question; and those who organise missionary effort feel it to be their duty to specify that feature of Christianity which is to be presented most prominently to the heathen, as its most vital and essential part. A perpetual discussion on this subject goes on in the more intelligent sections of the community; and the Church incessantly finds it necessary to declare what elements of the faith committed to her keeping are specially to be insisted on. The Church has to guard against attempts which are made, and constantly renewed, on the one hand, to narrow Christianity down to a special type of religious experience, and, on the other, to extend it so widely as to sever it from its historical root, and from the true source of its strength. The creeds, it is true, remain unchanged, but each generation has a new view of

what is most important in the creeds, and the Church finds out ever afresh what the truth is which she is specially called to uphold.

At the present time, especially, the question of the essence of Christianity is brought in a very pressing way under our notice. In several departments of theology the inquiry has recently attained great prominence and urgency, what Christianity really and essentially is, and these discussions are not of an unimportant or ephemeral nature, but are undoubtedly destined to grow in volume, and to force themselves on the attention of all earnest minds. The inquiry as to the true nature of our religion is obviously a vast one, and is capable of being treated on a very extensive scale. This paper aims at no more than the suggestion of some of its more immediately important aspects. The first of these is connected with comparative religion. If Christianity is to be brought into the general study of religion, and to be compared in a satisfactory way with other faiths, a definition of essential Christianity is obviously called for. In the second place, it may be asked whether the definition thus required for the purposes of comparative religion is suited for the needs of those who are living in the religion and depend on it for their spiritual guidance and nourishment. That school of German theology which is at present most full of life and spirit—namely, the so-called Ritschlian school—is content with such a view of Christianity as recommends itself to the science of religion, and holds with apostolic fervour that only with such a view of it can the sources of Christian faith and enthusiasm flow as they should. We shall indicate the basis which is thus recommended for our faith, and shall conclude by pointing out what appear to us to be its deficiencies.

I

If the study of comparative religion is to be carried on not as a matter of external facts and of statistics only, but in a manner worthy of the historic and philosophic interest surrounding it, the question must be asked with regard to each of the great religions, what is its essential and characteristic element. Every religion which continues for some time in the world undergoes in the course of its growth various modifications, so that it presents a different appearance in one century from that which it had in the century before. And a religion which spreads far in the world, and becomes the faith of many lands and nations, necessarily assumes a great variety of forms. Amid all these differences of time and place the student is compelled to ask what is the underlying unity in the religion which is to be recognised in all its forms. Till this inquiry has been made with regard to the different religions no true or satisfactory comparison of them is possible. We may, indeed, forbear from this difficult inquiry, and content ourselves with a series of external observations. Such and such religions, we may observe, agree in having sacred books, in such a set of them each has a doctrine of incarnation, more or less refined, or a doctrine of redemption, and those of such a group agree in the practice of preaching as an aid to the religious life, or as an element of worship. Such an external comparison, however, does not lead far. It leads to a knowledge of the general laws of growth which all religions more or less observe, and it enables us to classify them in various ways ; but it does not aid us in the appreciation of the peculiar genius of a religion taken by itself, or of the contribution made by it to the whole sum of the religious aspirations of mankind. We require to know the religions in a deeper and more intimate way,

and must, if possible, specify in the case of each of them what is the germ out of which it grows, and what is the central line of its development from that germ. What is the essential part of it, we must ask; what is that element in it which is present in all its true and genuine forms? And what in these forms is accidental and belongs to the particular age and nation, or to the framework which every religion must assume in order to continue and rule, rather than to the special genius of that particular faith?

This applies to the case of Christianity also, unless indeed our own religion is to be withdrawn from the ken of comparative theology; a proposal of which we shall have a word or two to say directly. Christianity has passed through as rich a growth, and has had as eventful a history, as any other faith: it has, therefore, worn widely different aspects in various ages. It has also spread widely, and in becoming the faith of many nations in north, south, east, and west, has adapted itself to the character and requirements of each in such a way as to put on a great variety of forms. When we are asked to compare Christianity with any of the religions which it superseded, or with any of those now existing beside it in the world, must we not, in order to do so in a manner at all satisfactory, inquire first of all what Christianity itself is? In a scientific discussion we are not entitled to assume that the faith and practice of the Western Church alone is Christianity, still less that of the Church of England alone, or that of the Church of Scotland alone. The beliefs and rites of Italy are very different from those of England, and so, in another direction, are those of the Scottish Highlander, and many another very marked variation might be mentioned. All of these alike call themselves Christian, and the name cannot be refused to any of them. Is there

then a unity in all these forms of Christianity, and in what does that unity consist? What is the essence of this religion? What is the central fact or view, out of which all this bewildering variety of forms has sprung, and with which we must assume that they are all to some extent inspired? Till we have answered this question any comparison we institute between our own religion and others must be quite inconclusive and ineffective. Our argument must be vitiated by the fatal flaw that we are using a term which we have not defined, and using it in a sense which our critics, *i.e.*, all those belonging to other faiths, and the great majority of those holding our own, are likely to call in question.

We might, it is true, make up our minds not to include Christianity in our survey of the religions of the world; indeed, it is urged in many quarters that this is the right course to pursue. A Christian student of comparative theology at least, we are told, ought not to include his own religion in that study. But it is impossible thus to isolate one religion, even though it be our own, and stands, to our eyes, far above the rest, as it is much nearer and much dearer; nor would it be to the advantage of our religion that it should be kept apart from the study of the world's worships. To except Christianity would be to deprive that study of its crowning interest and value, and to degrade it to an inquiry into mere antiquities and curiosities far removed from our own thoughts and lives. We see at once, when the proposal is stated, how impossible it is, and how unworthy of Christianity it would be, to keep it thus apart. We may be sure, moreover, that if the friends of our religion do not bring it into comparison with others, its enemies will certainly do so, and to its disadvantage.

Comparative religion then requires us to say what we mean by Christianity. In pursuing this science we must seek our definition of Christianity according to the same method as that which is observed in other cases. Now the method by which it is attempted to define the essence of a religion is as follows. First, there is the case of a national religion, which does not owe its existence to the definite action of a great personality, recognised as its founder, but is known to have grown up gradually with, and in the growth of, the nation. Here we start from the firm principle that the religion of a people expresses its deepest views, and most characteristic aspirations. We, therefore, inquire, in the first place, about the nation ; we ask, to what family of the world's inhabitants it belongs, and what dower it brought with it originally from that family ; we consider the land in which it settled, and the influence such a land might be expected to have on such a people ; and thus we endeavour to understand, and to account for, the special character which distinguishes that nation from others. The character of the nation explains to us its religion, and helps us to understand the attitude it took up towards its gods, and the nature of the prayers and offerings it thought necessary to present to them. Now this process is only partly applicable to Christianity, but to a certain extent it has to be applied. To understand the differences between Eastern and Western Christianity, or between the worship which prevails to the south of the Alps and that of Northern Europe, or even between the religion of the Teuton and that of the Celt, some such process as we have described must be resorted to. The reason why Christianity has assumed such different forms in the various countries which have adopted it, is that no two nations are alike in their characters and ideals, and

that Christianity had to adapt itself to a great variety of national characters, and to establish itself in the place of a number of different national religions. In each case it was inevitably coloured by the religion it supplanted. To understand the local differences of Christianity, therefore, we have to study the characters of the various Christian nations, or, which is almost the same thing, the nature of the old religions.

But Christianity is something more than a group of national religions. It shares with a small number of other faiths the distinction that it traces its origin to a personal founder. And the problem of a religion which was founded by a certain person is quite different from that of the religion which grew up imperceptibly with the growth of a nation. How do we proceed in this case to fix the essence of a religion which has spread far and continued long?

To do this is the office of literary and historical criticism. The books have to be examined which supply our information as to the life and teaching of the founder; they have to be placed in their true historical order instead of the traditional order in which they have been arranged for purposes of edification; and they have to be tested in various ways. The attempt has to be made to separate the original historical facts which they contain from the additions made to them later by pious imagination. The acts and words from which so wonderful a growth proceeded have to be cleared as far as possible from the doubts and shadows which rest on all records of extraordinary occurrences in the distant past, and established as historically certain. It stands to reason that the germ from which the great and spreading plant of a religion sprang, must be sought at the very beginning of its history. It is there

that the secret and mystery must lie which have wrought so powerfully in the world. To understand that secret and mystery we have to study the history of the founder; nothing else will help us. We must examine the nature of the ground in which he sowed his seed. We must ask what were the wants and perplexities which weighed upon his countrymen and what attempts had been made before him to solve the problem of the time. We must study the person of the founder himself, and try to understand both how he came to be what he was, and how it was that his acts and words operated so powerfully. Nothing that takes place in the religion afterwards is nearly so important as this. This is the unity in the religion, which was there before any differences began to show themselves, and to which all schools and parties in it afterwards alike appeal. What the founder did and said was, especially his acts of devotion, his prayers and observances, how he trained and encouraged his followers, how he bore himself towards unbelievers, and with what views he looked forward to the future of his cause, all these things have in the eyes of the faithful in after ages an inexpressible interest. They feel that the nature of their religion was fixed then and there. Even when far other considerations than these come to the front in its subsequent history, when it has come to possess a sacred canon and a hierarchy and a creed, and to insist on many a doctrine and many an observance of which the founder never dreamed, still his figure and his words dwell in the hearts of all believers; these constitute the power on which the stately sacerdotal system is built up; these are the standard of the religion, and if it is not acted up to, at least it can never be denied. What is plainly contrary to that standard, though supported by ever so high authority, and buttressed by vested interests which seem

entirely unassailable, is felt to be a usurpation, and is doomed sooner or later to be changed.

The method, then, is clear, by which the essence of a personally founded religion must be determined. Very little reflection is needed to show that it is the only possible method. Only in the founder do all the lines of thought converge which exist in the widely branching religion. No words which are spoken in it afterwards can ever have the same authority as his. When once the founder has lived his life and delivered his message, no radical alteration can afterwards take place in the religion without removing him from his place as its central figure and so destroying the enthusiasm by which it is nourished. The founder cannot divide his power with any other, or hand it over to any successor. He and he only has the words of life for all his followers ; the essence of his religion is to be sought in him alone.

If there is any truth in the principles now stated, then we can be in no doubt to what quarter the student of religion must look for the answer to his inquiry as to the essence of Christianity. For the purposes of the science of religion at least, there is only one course open, and it is to go to the records of the life and teaching of Christ, as we go to the narrative of the life of Buddha to learn what is the essence of Buddhism, or to the early chapters (chronologically) of the Koran for the essence of Islam. And as in these cases so also in that of Christianity, we must not take the records as we find them, but must invoke the aid of criticism to sift and arrange them. An attempt has to be made to eliminate those parts of them which show vestiges of literary growth posterior to the lifetime of the founder, to trace the outline of the life as it actually happened, and to collect the sayings which can be shown to

belong undoubtedly to the original teaching. Should it prove that these critical processes can be carried out successfully, and that they lead to results on which we can depend, there will be placed before us by their aid that which we must regard as the headspring of Christianity. Here we shall find Christianity in its earliest stage, before it threw out any variations, and before any doubt arose as to the purport of its message. It may be true, as an active school of critics contends, that many other causes besides the appearance of the Founder must have been at work in starting the movement; but, on the other hand, the story of the Founder could not have held the place it does did it not express in the most lifelike way the genius of the religion. Such is the figure, such the doctrine which all followers of the religion agree in recognising as their standard. When, therefore, we understand the character and teaching of the Founder of Christianity, we may disregard, as bearing on the question of the essence of the faith, the various types into which the original message afterwards branched out. This, though the apostles afterwards connected it with different kinds of doctrines, and though the Church in the moulding of her system may seem to have forgotten it, is the original truth of Christianity, which remains present in the religion even when it is most neglected, and which is always capable of being called to the front and of asserting its true place as the standard of Christian belief and practice, and the spring of Christian enthusiasm. To the science of religion, at least, the essence of Christianity is to be found in the Gospels only; it is Christ Himself, living, teaching, suffering, dying. The life as there enshrined, and the doctrine, not as a set of loosely connected precepts, but as a unity—criticism can surely recover the unity which must have been there at

first—as a view of life and a principle of life not only spoken in words, but expressed by the Founder's whole personality, and embodied and demonstrated in all He was and did; these must be the primary element of Christianity, the unity amid all its variations, and the source of its power. What comes later in the growth of our religion cannot be so important as this. However far-reaching and momentous later developments may have been in forming the beliefs of Christendom, these later growths cannot be regarded as primary. They are not the type; they belong to the variations of the type; they are not the essence, but the accidents of Christianity.

II

We now turn to look at our problem from another point of view. Comparative religion, we have seen, looking at Christianity from the outside, and treating it impartially by the same method as it applies in other cases of the same kind, seeks to arrive at the required definition of our religion by taking the records of the Founder's life and teaching and subjecting them to critical treatment, so as to make out as far as possible the original facts and ideas from which the Christian movement sprang. Is this procedure suited to the wants of those who are not outside observers of Christianity, but are living in it, and who depend on it for their spiritual reassurance and nourishment? Must the definition of Christianity arrived at by comparative religion be left behind when we proceed to study our religion from within? Or must large additions be made to it; must we add to it various elements of Christian thought which are not presented to us in the Gospels and which only attained their development after

the lifetime of the Master, at the hands of the apostles, or of the Church in later centuries? These, no doubt, are questions regarding which every Christian of intelligence has had his thoughts, and which are constantly coming to the surface wherever Christian men take counsel together, whether in pulpit, or press, or in ordinary conversation, as to the nature and the requirements of their faith. Nothing can be said on them which has not already occurred to every mind of average penetration. And yet much must be said about them still.

On the one hand, we must expect to be told that to regard the critical results of the study of the Gospels as furnishing what is to be regarded as essential Christianity is to assign to Biblical criticism a function which it cannot discharge, since criticism, if thoroughly carried out, is a negative rather than a positive science, and rather takes away what is dear to religion than affords to religion its material and nourishment. The criticism of the Gospels in particular, it will be said, is in too unsettled a state, and embraces too many great questions which are still disputed, to allow us to hope that it can yield us the clear representations on which faith may rest. The relations of the Gospels to each other are not yet determined, the life of Christ is in great part quite unknown, and, where it is known, the true construction of the facts is much disputed. As for the words of Christ, they are recorded so differently in the different narratives, and so many words placed in His mouth are held by many scholars to be due to later growths of the tradition, that it is impossible to make a collection of them which can be regarded with confidence, or to draw up any satisfactory reasoned account of His teaching as a whole. All this will be said on the one side, not by sceptics, but by men of the strongest orthodoxy ; and, on

the other side, it must, of course, appear to many that a great deal of what is most essential in Christianity is not found in the Gospels at all. Archbishop Whately, the writer has heard from one who knew him, was accustomed to warn young men against expecting to find the Gospel in the Gospels. His way of thinking is not dead, but widely prevalent; an account of Christianity which is taken from the Gospels alone must seem to very many to be quite one-sided and fatally inadequate. It is a common experience, and one at which we cannot wonder, that when an attempt is made to draw up a statement of what may claim to be universally regarded as the original Christian truth, and when for this purpose the writer follows closely the words of the Master Himself and does not travel beyond the Master's own teaching, the cry at once arises from Churchmen and doctors of the faith that that is not Christianity, and that it is to degrade and insult our religion to state it in such a way. That, we say, is not to be wondered at.

I venture, however, to plead that we should not be turned back by such difficulties from at least considering what seems, at first sight, to be a reasonable course of procedure. Let us ask what kind of basis the believing Christian will have for his religion, if he should determine that it ought to be founded, at least in the first instance, on the Gospels, and on the Gospels critically treated. Only the salient points, of course, of such a faith can here be indicated.

We noticed the assertion that criticism, and especially the criticism of the Gospels, is not well fitted to furnish a positive basis for faith. It may be suggested that this objection is not so applicable to the present stage of the study of the Gospels as to some of its earlier stages, and

that if historical facts are ever suited to provide the starting-point of religion, the facts contained in the Gospels as they are now coming to be known are eminently adapted to render us this service. It may, indeed, be maintained that the seed-plot of religion must always be sought in the ideal rather than the real, and that bare historical facts can never furnish the ideal element in which religion has its rise. It depends on the kind of facts that are in question. There appears to be no antecedent reason why religion should always take its rise in circumstances which are historically misty and obscure. Nor is there any reason why facts which are historically certain and plain should not carry us very close to the ideals which religion needs. If the facts of the Gospel history are being cleared of doubts and uncertainties, they will surely act not less, but more effectively, if in themselves they are of a nature to suggest the reality of spiritual things. And thus criticism, which in the first instance takes away what is dear to piety, may prove here to have more to give than ever it took away. All criticism sets out with questions and denials, and the criticism of the Gospels, carried on during the last two generations, certainly did so. But the ultimate aim of criticism is not to deny, but to build up, and the very negations with which it sets out tend, by awakening inquiry and showing the weak points of the traditional view of a subject, to bring about in time a positive and scientific construction, every part of which has been well tested, and may therefore be regarded with confidence. And it may be maintained that the criticism of the Gospels has now, in the main, passed through its negative stage, and is bringing into view a body of positive results for which the devout Christian may be expected, as soon as he understands their bearing, to be extremely thankful. We

do not speak here of the Gospel of John, with regard to which all will probably agree that the process of determining the precise amount of historical fact it may contain is less advanced in its case than in that of the first three Gospels. Nor do we forget that many questions connected with the Synoptic Gospels cannot yet be answered. But few scholars will deny that the origin of these works and their relation to each other, as well as the main outlines of the story they jointly contain, and also the scope of the teaching of the Master, are much better understood to-day than they were thirty years ago. The comparatively new method of studying the three first Gospels in synopsis, comparing the order in which the matter is presented in each and the form in which the individual sections appear in each of them, that method is gradually bringing to light the simple story which underlies them all. We see far more clearly than we did formerly the first impressions made by Jesus on His friends and on His countrymen; we also see more clearly what He Himself thought of the work He had come to do, and of the extraordinary powers He found Himself to possess for the discharge of His mission. There is still, no doubt, much difference of opinion on many important points, such as the precise stage at which He came to recognise Himself as the Messiah, and the meaning of the title, "Son of Man," which He adopted. But the figure as a whole, and the story as a whole, are becoming more clear and definite, and not less so under the work of the criticism of the Gospels. We know much better than formerly both the public and the inner life of Jesus, and the nature both of His acts and of His teaching. In such works as Holtzmann's "Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels"[1] and Wendt's

[1] *Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Mohr, Freiburg; vol. i.

"Doctrine of Jesus,"[1] the new structure begins to be visible which the long and arduous process of criticism has been preparing. Of lives of Jesus the supply has in recent times been somewhat scanty, of such works, at least, as are written with due regard to critical knowledge; and those which were written a quarter of a century ago were based on critical positions which are now for the most part abandoned. When a new life of Jesus comes to be written by a scholar thoroughly equipped for the task and gifted with the necessary sympathy and insight, it will be found to tell a simpler and a more interesting story than that of either Renan or Keim, not to speak of the confused productions written in our own country. The incidents will be sketched more firmly, and the inner processes in the mind of Jesus will be traced more adequately than they have ever been. Like every great religious teacher, Jesus is made much more real by the new methods of historical study. He is brought much nearer to us; we understand much with regard to Him that was formerly obscure and mysterious, and the origin of our religion becomes, while not less wonderful, more convincing to our judgment, more irresistible to our sympathies.

It would obviously far exceed the limits at our disposal did we attempt to trace even the merest outlines of the life and teaching of Jesus as they are now coming to be known. All we can do is to notice a few points bearing on our present inquiry as to the claim of that life and teaching to be regarded as conveying to us the essence of the Christian religion.

One fact which appears more and more strongly, may stand first. There can be no greater error on this subject than that of regarding Jesus as a teacher only, or as one

[1] Translated for T. & T. Clark by Rev. James Wilson.

who propounded a new theory of the world or of human life, and trusted to the inner force of truth to bring about the victory of His doctrine. The apostles knew well that the religion they preached was not a word so much as a power. Jesus cannot be classed with the philosophers. If ever a philosopher founded a religion, which may be very much doubted, it was not He. It was not from the intellectual, but from the moral and religious sphere that those acts and words came forth by which He moved His fellow-countrymen and then the world. His whole life was rooted in religion, that is to say, in the sense of need, and in conscious intercourse with the Unseen Power by which the sorrows of men are comforted and their deepest needs supplied. He felt, as others did not feel, the whole depth and intensity of the distresses under which His fellow-countrymen laboured: "He took their infirmities and bore their sicknesses." It was evident to Him how little remedy there was for these infirmities and sicknesses in the common religion of the day. Official piety made the way to God not easy but difficult for these weary and heavy-laden souls, and even when they trod most conscientiously the path marked out for them they found little comfort. Jesus undertook to remedy this state of things, not as a philosopher with a new doctrine which might bear fruit in a coming generation, but as a Saviour who was able to give rest and guidance at once, then and there. To ignore the practical side of His activity, and to judge of His doctrine as if it stood alone and might have been spoken by another and been associated with a different kind of life, is fatally to misjudge both the character of Jesus and that of His teaching.

It was in religion, moreover, that the salvation of which He spoke was to be found. The remedy He offered for

all the ills of life, the permanent remedy (for the cures He wrought furnished at the best but a transient alleviation), lay in religion, in that life towards God in which His own days were spent, and which brought Him peace in all His temptations and afflictions. Others might share that life with God, and He summoned them to do so. The kingdom had come and every one could enter it and live with God as child with father. This was the pearl of great price which a man might do well to part with all he had to purchase. In this kingdom all who should enter it would find a happiness which would amply compensate them for all outward ills and sacrifices; all mourners would find comfort, all hunger and thirst would be satisfied; then those who put forward no claims would find that all their wishes were fulfilled. To bring to men these highest comforts Jesus came forward. He appeared as one filled by a higher Power, and spoke and acted like one of the old prophets, but as a greater than they, strength in His arm, fire on His tongue. He declared that which He knew Himself, but that also which He knew to be open and accessible to all, as the sovereign remedy for all the evils under which men labour.

And thus it was that Jesus became the Founder of Christianity. To found a religion is to bring to men afresh the conviction of the reality and the nearness and the help of God; and he is the greatest religious founder who does this in such a way that the relation with God which he opens up will continue longest; who goes down, that is to say, most simply and directly to the needs which all men feel, and complicates his teaching least with details which belong to a particular place or time. Such a founder of religion we believe Jesus to have been to a degree far beyond all others. He grasped the essential wants and

longings of the human soul, and felt them Himself most deeply. And He was convinced, at the same time, of the reality and nearness, wherever these wants were felt, of the Heavenly Power which was able to far more than relieve them. That He conceived this intercourse with God in so broad and deep a way that it proved afterwards not to be limited to any particular race, and that He did not wrap it up in any form which might have made its acceptance hard, this shows how great He was, and how truly the saying was applied to Him that "in His name should the Gentiles trust."

All communication of religious impressions, it may be affirmed, takes place less by precept than by example. Of the teaching of Jesus, at least, this may be said with confidence. He taught nothing that He was not actually living Himself, nothing that He had not gone through so that He could state it as a fact of His own experience. He preached Himself; and the doctrine had power because it was seen to be not a mere doctrine, but a life of the greatest depth and intensity clothing itself in simple words. Those who saw and heard Him felt themselves to be witnessing an intercourse with God such as they had not conceived before, and true souls were drawn irresistibly to come near to that intercourse, and to enter it themselves. In urging His fellow-countrymen to have faith in God, and to recognise Him as their Father in heaven, to live with Him as His children, and to accept in all things His will, to look to Him for daily help where they most needed help, and confidently to expect His aid and consolation, Jesus did but call them to stand where He already stood, and to be as He was. Those who stood nearest to Him saw most clearly that this was so, and thus the spread of the religion to other lives took place less by intellectual

conviction than by the force of personal example. New possibilities had been opened up to the early converts in their own lives, the attractive power of the Master Himself, combined with the new motives called to life in their heart, left them no choice but to follow Him.

As for the teaching of Jesus, that part of it at least which is not taken up with polemics, but with the moral and spiritual life, it is simply the working out of the position in which He stood Himself, and in which He called others to stand, towards God and towards men. What manner of persons must those be who are living in God's kingdom, and who look to Him as their Father in heaven, that is the principal theme of it. It tells of the spontaneous and unfettered piety which they must cultivate, of the urgent prayers they must employ in all their necessities, of the hard self-conquest they must aim at, of the unintermitted efforts they must make to advance, and not fall back. It also tells them what they must be in their relation with others, if they are the children of such a Father, how forgiving and how merciful, how heedless of their own claims and rights, how considerate even of the weaknesses and prejudices of others, how patient, how humble, how bent on doing good, good always and everywhere, and never evil, under any provocation or any pretext whatever. In the Epistles and the Acts we can see, to a large extent, how the followers of Jesus understood His teaching, and in what ways they strove to carry it out in their daily habits and practices, and in their social arrangements.

The above sketch is, of course, most inadequate ; but it indicates the manner in which the foundation of the Christian religion took place at the hands of the Saviour. It was thus, the historical treatment of the sources enables us to see, that the religion which dwelt first in Christ Himself,

and the revelation of God which He brought, first passed from Him to others. It is little to say that the criticism which brings these results clearly before us is not negative or destructive. On the contrary, it makes the Gospels infinitely more interesting to us, and infinitely more full of religious substance, than they could ever be when we brought to our reading of them a theological system to which they must be made to conform. We feel afresh the mighty impulse which came through the acts and words of Jesus to the souls of His countrymen, and the awakening which He brought to pass in them of a new earth and sky, filled with thoughts and aspirations unknown before. We feel with them that God has visited His people, and each familiar word wears for us a new meaning. Those who have tried it are able to speak from experience of the eager interest the Gospel narrative awakens in classes of young men and women of ordinary education, when it is put before them in such a way as criticism can approve. By extracting from the Gospels the original story which underlies them and presenting, without *arrière pensée* of doctrine, the actual facts of the history of Jesus, and the unalloyed words of His teaching, they find that they wield a far mightier instrument than they ever had before for compelling men to take an interest in Christ, and for bringing them under the influence of His Gospel.

It is no doubt the case that Christians have always recognised the supreme authority in their religion of the Master Himself, and that His word has always been regarded as their law. There is nothing new, it may be thankfully acknowledged, in what we have here stated. No other authority has prevailed nearly so universally among Christian people as that of the Saviour Himself. In all ages of the Church and in all Christian lands it has been felt that

the supreme appeal lay there, if only it were possible to have recourse to it; and the authority of the Saviour has been the basis on which every other authority that has ever prevailed in Christendom has professed to be founded. There is nothing new or unheard of in the statement that Christians must ask in every matter which admits of such treatment, "What does Christ say? How would Christ have us act? Is such and such a doctrine or rite or practice in accordance with the mind of Christ?" What is pointed out is that the words and the example of Christ are now placed before us more clearly and more certainly than they ever were before, and that, as the results of the criticism of the Gospels become more widely diffused, we may expect that this supreme tribunal of Christian people will be better known and more generally resorted to than it ever was before since the earliest Christian age. There is no excuse possible save ignorance for not resorting to it now. The confusions and difficulties which have impeded the spread of essential Christianity have arisen in large measure from the facts that the Gospels were not rightly understood and that their purport was obscured by views and considerations arising from elsewhere. Now that we are coming to know what the Gospels really contain, we are placed in a position in which Christians have never stood before since the second century, for deriving the inspiration of our religious life from the Master Himself, and for applying His laws to the affairs of our souls and of our daily conduct. We have obtained in a greater degree than our forefathers for many centuries the opportunity of observing Christ's words and acts, and of coming in contact with Him, not through the medium of ecclesiastical doctrines and traditions, but in some measure as those did who "saw and touched and handled" the Word of Life.

What they obtained from that contact, we also in a measure may obtain. If the effect was with them that they looked to no one but Him, and listened to no words but His, for their comfort and guidance, and that in doing this they felt themselves to be made partakers of the divine life He brought into the world, it may be well for us to drink of the same spring. The simple creed of the infant Church, that "Jesus is Lord," might possibly be enough for our creed. If to us as to them Jesus is the Messiah, who fulfils our best hopes and brings us into a divine communion and a heavenly kingdom, then surely we are warranted to believe that we possess the main qualifications of His followers, and that we have embraced what is most original, most universal, and most essential in His religion.

III

We have seen that, in order to institute a satisfactory comparison of Christianity with other religions, we require to go back beyond all the variations of Christian belief and rite to the unity which is to be found in the Founder Himself alone. And we have seen that, to those living in the Christian community, the Master Himself is the highest authority; and further, that the criticism of the Gospels, far from making His figure or His teaching less clear or less impressive, brings Him much nearer to us, and makes it both easier and more necessary to consult Him. The essence of our religion then would seem, so far as we have gone, to be conveyed to us in the Synoptic Gospels. It is in these works that we learn what our religion was at its first inception, and what every genuine form of it must be, at least approximately. To be a Christian, accordingly, is to hear the voice of the Master as it may there be heard,

to take up His yoke and follow Him, and to receive from Him His spirit, and walk in it, both in our life towards God and in our life with men.

But Christianity, as it now exists in the world, embraces a great deal more than this. The religion of Christ early surrounded itself, as every set of ideas must do which is to continue in the world and to rule over men's minds, with a set of institutions and arrangements, of which it may at least be said that the Founder had given no detailed instructions for them. Even in the New Testament we can see the beginning of certain growths in Christianity, which have little organic connection with the teaching of the Founder. The Church begins even there to acquire a constitution; functionaries of various kinds are recognised; a distinctively Christian order of worship appears; certain books of Christian origin acquire high esteem; and the creed of Christianity outgrows its earliest form, that Jesus is the Messiah, and contains further statements about Him. These movements, seen in germ in the New Testament, had afterwards a very extensive development; and in the end of the second century Christianity was fully equipped with an episcopal order of government, a liturgy, a canon of sacred books, and a creed, which, as Professor Harnack and our own lamented Dr. Hatch point out, gave the religion a very different appearance from that which it wore in apostolic times. What now claimed the attention of the Christian was not, as formerly, at least not to the same degree as formerly, the discipline of following the Master and living with the brethren in faith and love; his duty now consisted in obeying the bishop, observing the rites and services of the Church, and believing the statements of the creed. Especially on the side of belief, the change from primitive Christianity to Christianity fully

formed, was very great. Dr. Hatch begins his Hibbert Lectures (1888) by pointing out the difference between the Christianity of the origin and that of the State Church in the fourth century, as illustrated by the Sermon on the Mount, on the one hand, and on the other by the Nicene Creed. Between the dates of these two forms of words Christianity has assumed the character of a philosophy in addition to that of a religion; the creed which the Christian of the Nicene period was taught to recite contains a view of the creation of the world, of the inner nature of the Deity, of the dealings of God with man through Jesus Christ, and of the future history of the world. The Christian, in professing this faith, does far more than express his attachment to the Founder. He expresses his belief on a great variety of subjects, adheres implicitly to a certain school of philosophy, and abjures a large number of heresies.

Now, the belief at which the Church arrived after three centuries of discussion, and which is deposited in the great creeds, is the official belief of the Church still; and most Christians, if asked to state the essence of their religion, would at once refer to the creed, the Nicene or the apostolic, and would say that the essential truth of Christianity was summed up in that statement, and that a Christian was one who believed the creed. In the Puritan theology matters are slightly different. Here that person is to be regarded as a Christian, or has a share in the Christian salvation, who has faith in Christ; in Christ, that is, as represented in that theology, namely, as the Mediator between God and man, and as the Redeemer of God's elect. This implies that he believes in the theological system in question, a system presupposing the old creeds, but adding to them a large superstructure of its own.

Now, neither the old creeds nor the documents of Westminster, to take the latter as typical of the Reformed theology, lay any stress on the teaching of Christ as contained in the Gospels, nor on the necessity of knowing Christ as He is there brought before us. The teaching of Christ does not form, as every one is aware, the basis of the doctrine of the Church. That doctrine appeals rather to the Epistles than the Gospels for its warrant in Scripture, and as for the teaching of Christ, it lies outside the Church doctrine, as if the Church, intent on her own intellectual system, had not known what to make of the teaching of Christ and had left it alone. This is indeed the case; but the teaching of Christ is coming now to be better understood, and perhaps cannot be treated in that way any longer. At all events, it is now clearly seen that there are two elements in Christianity, for each of which the claim may be advanced that it is the essential part of the religion, and is entitled to take precedence of every other, and to be regarded as the standard of Christian thought. The teaching of Christ, on the one hand, no one would deny to be the oldest and the least disputed form of the religion; and wherever Christian life runs high, it is apt to be appealed to as the principal, if not the only, norm of that life. On the other hand, the creed, the system arrived at by intellectual reflexion some time after the Founder, and when His ideas had grown fainter, has established itself in the centre of the religion, and claims to be accepted by every one who assumes a Christian name. Here manifestly we have the elements of a great controversy, which cannot fail to spread far and to continue long. Which of these two elements of Christianity is to be regarded as the essence? Which of the two is the preacher to urge more prominently than the other? When the missionary

addresses himself to a heathen tribe, is he to teach them first the life and doctrine of the Saviour, or the creed of the Church, or both as equally essential? And those who teach theology, are they to regard the Gospels or the creeds as conveying the primary truth of the religion they are appointed to serve, and to which are they to consider their allegiance to be in the first place due?

These questions evidently will not be settled this year or this century. I desire, before concluding this paper, to draw attention to a very remarkable answer which is now being made to them. What is called the Ritschlian theology is now championed in Germany by many scholars of the highest name and of wide influence. Two of the most radical works produced by this theology are now appealing by translations to readers in this country; and in some quarters great things are hoped from this source for the improvement of theology on our own side of the Channel. "The Truth of the Christian Religion"[1] is the name of a very able and learned book by Professor Kaftan of Berlin, which is introduced to the English public by Professor Flint of Edinburgh. And "The Christian's Intercourse with God,"[2] by Professor Hermann of Marburg, is published in English in Messrs. Williams & Norgate's new series of Theological Translations.

Now, both of these books are written in a warm line of Evangelical fervour and conviction. It does one good to read them. But in both there is the most entire and sweeping repudiation of the traditional theology, the theology of the creeds, as belonging to the essential truth of Christianity, or as a possible form for the presentation of the religion in the present age. To the eyes of both

[1] 1894. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.
[2] *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott.*

these writers alike, the whole theological movement of Christianity has been a great aberration, and has given the religion an appearance which is quite foreign to its true nature. Dr. Hermann heaps ridicule on the idea of offering the creed to an educated person of the present day, and requiring him, if he desires to be a Christian, to believe such statements. To him the creeds and their theology are a great obstacle to the acceptance of Christianity in the modern world; if the religion is to spread, he holds, it must be by offering itself in a very different form. Dr. Hermann's view of what constitutes the active, propagative element of Christianity, is one of great force and beauty. It is by contact with the inner life of Jesus as known to us in the Gospels, he holds, that faith arises; there is no other way than this in which a man can become a Christian indeed. When our eyes are opened to perceive and understand the inner life of Jesus, the discovery produces such an effect on us as to make us certain that God Himself has turned His face towards us, and that the true life of religion has begun in us. This is the knowledge which is essential to Christianity; no other is essential. According to Hermann, Christianity ought to have no creed regarding anything but the inner religious experience which is produced by contact with Christ in the Gospels. So entirely is the ruling creed of Christendom rejected.

Dr. Kaftan is still more explicit. The earlier part of his book is taken up with a very able demonstration of the way in which Christianity was in the early centuries diverted from its true nature and prevented from speaking to the world with its own proper voice, by coming under the influence of Greek ideas and allowing itself to be turned into a philosophy. The religion consisted at first in conduct, and it ought never to have allowed itself to be

turned into a system of knowledge. Nor was this terrible mistake, committed at the entrance of Christianity on its empire, made good, as other mistakes were, at the Reformation. The Reformation did not reform doctrine, as it might have done, nor revert to the simplicity of the ideas of Christ; and the consequence was, in Kaftan's words, that "Protestantism was loaded with a dogmatic which does not answer the purposes of the Evangelical Church, and which that Church must, sooner or later, discard." He finds that the philosophers, while seeking to preserve doctrine by showing it to be philosophically true, have accomplished its entire and total ruin. "Doctrine cannot again be built up in the Protestant Church; dogma cannot now be accepted by those who have a single eye to the truth of our religion. The sum of the whole matter is, that the proof of Christianity by doctrine has broken down"; by which our author means that the view of the world expressed in the creeds cannot now be accepted by educated persons as the keystone of their knowledge of the world, and that the Church, out of a regard for her own interests, ought no longer to uphold that system of belief.

Dr. Kaftan finds the essence of Christianity in the idea of the "kingdom of God," which was the burden of the preaching of Jesus, though it passed so quickly out of sight in that of His followers. In seeking thus to bring to the front of Christian teaching the unselfish social idea with which our religion came into existence, he may reckon on the sympathy of those, and they are not few, who are turning in this age from an individualistic to a more communistic mode of thought in morals and in religion. And many undoubtedly will welcome the attempt made by these German thinkers with such fervour to draw the in-

spiration of the Christian life from Christ Himself as He is found in the Gospels. But it is possible to agree with them very cordially in this view, and yet to hold that Christianity, to be a complete religion, must necessarily have what they deny it, namely, a creed dealing with various matters of belief besides those present in direct religious experience ; and also that the growth of doctrine in the Church has been something more than a mere progress of error. The repudiation of the creed by these theologians, it may be remarked, is intimately connected with the agnostic position, for it may be so described, which they occupy in philosophy. They are the sworn foes of idealism, and will not hear of any attempt to interpret the world by intellectual ideas. Thus they reject the interpretation of the world by the ideas of the creeds, and they insist that Christianity must not seek to interpret the world in a system of knowledge at all, but must restrict itself to the sphere of conduct and renounce the claim to authority as a theory of the universe. Theology, instead of being the mother of all the sciences, is to confine herself to the study of the phenomena of religious experience, and the dream of a unity of knowledge to be gained through religion is to be entirely abandoned. Thus the demand, so often made by writers from without, of whom our own Matthew Arnold is a notable example, for a Christianity without metaphysic, for religion without dogma, for a return to the system of Christ at the sacrifice of the doctrine of the Church, has been taken up by eminent professors of divinity, who claim to be the exponents of the one true and evangelical Christianity. And we are enabled to see to what issues that view of religion ultimately leads, what a divorce it involves between faith and knowledge, what an invertebrate religion on the one hand, what a

surrender on the other of all hope of a unity of knowledge under a religious idea.

The writings of these German theologians would seem to indicate that unbelief of Christian doctrine has reached a more extreme point in Germany than it can yet be said to have attained in our own country. No public teacher of theology in Britain could propose such a desperate remedy as theirs for the estrangement of the educated world from Christian doctrine. We may indeed expect that the teaching of the Ritschlian school, a teaching of such earnestness and fervour, and so representative of many of the tendencies, both intellectual and social, of the present age, will appear among ourselves, yet we may trust that we shall be spared the rude assaults on the Christian creed, and the sweeping condemnation of the whole development of doctrine with which the German apostles have appealed to their generation. In this country, it may be expected, at least, that a theology will not find ready acceptance which makes a fatal severance between faith and knowledge; and that we shall continue to seek in religion not only aspiration for life but also a view of the world, and an explanation of the riddles of existence. Our religion must tell us not only how we are to feel, and what we are to do, but also what we are to think, else it must come short of what religion has always professed to afford, and must always be called on to afford, to mankind. No religion can live long in any country which acknowledges no Supreme Being; and the fact that the God of the systems of Hermann and Kaftan has no relation to the outer world, but appears in religious experience only, is enough to warrant the expectation that their teaching will not become the basis of a working Church system either in their own or in any other country. For the rejection of

this part of the creed, at least, an inevitable retribution is at hand. The world cannot do without the belief in a Being in whom all things have their unity, who is supreme not only in the soul and conscience but also in the world of external Nature, who is the source of the natural order as well as of the moral law. And there is more of the creed than this which we cannot readily dispense with, and which, though walking in the full light of science and of criticism, we may still hope to hold. If we find in Jesus Christ the supreme revelation of the great God, and know Him to have opened up a new and living way to the Father, we must be led to reflect on the relation He bears to God, whose highest purpose for man He has thus accomplished, and on His relation to man, whose deepest wants He has supplied; and we shall not find the statements of the creeds on these points unworthy of respect and sympathy. If we find that by the sweet self-surrender, of which the cross is the great symbol, Christ brings us from the position of isolation and resistance which is natural to us, to a position of membership of a divine family, and of willing acceptance of the yoke of law and of duty, and that in this change our sins lose their power to paralyse us, we must reflect on these facts also; and for the redemption, which we and millions of others have experienced in Christianity, we must acknowledge Christ as the Redeemer. And for other features also of religious experience we shall be led to seek expression, framing them in statements which we do not regard as scientific truths but as truths of religion. Religion cannot get on without stating in the form of outward facts the great truths of the inner life; it must have doctrines; that is a law not of Christianity only but of all religion that is to continue and to bind men permanently together.

But while Christianity, like every religion, must have a creed, that is not to say that the creed is to be regarded as having the same authority as the original facts of the religion. Creeds are a part of that general apparatus which every religion must assume which is destined for continuance; they occupy a different position from the specific facts and ideas which are the original treasure of the particular religion; and the vessel ought not to be allowed to take the place of the contents of the vessel. Creeds are means to an end; they are for the truth, to help it in a rough way to be stated and handed on; not the truth for them. The Christian creeds contain the expression of Christian truth in the form of outward facts, which the early Church with infinite labour arrived at. But, while we recognise that the early Church was imperatively called to provide the religion of Christ with some such vestment, and while we thankfully acknowledge that the Church was not without higher guidance in this work, we cannot regard the creeds as possessed of any inviolable sacredness. They are the work of the Church; and the Church from time to time makes new creeds, articles of religion, or confessions of faith, which supplement, and in some cases all but supersede, the older ones. The Church which is alive and true to her duty must from time to time revise her creed, as new views and new applications of the truth appear. The present day, it is said, is not a time for any such work of construction. But the day will assuredly arrive when the Church, seeing her Master's face more clearly than she has ever done before, and with a simpler view of the work He accomplished for mankind, will feel irresistibly called to set forth in a new statement what she believes concerning Him. The starting-point is given us in the old yet ever new conviction that Jesus is the Messiah, and though the

attempts we have described to build up on this basis a consistent scheme of Christian thought must be deemed to have proved failures, new attempts to do so may succeed. Constructive theology will awaken in this country also (signs that this will be so are not wanting) to the noble task of proving that in religion the unity of human thought and knowledge may still be found, and that Christ is made to us of God in this age also, not only righteousness and sanctification and redemption, but also wisdom.

In the meantime we judge that the essence of Christianity is Christ Himself, as He appears in the Gospels, the revelation He there makes of God and of the true way of approaching Him, His teaching how the children of God should live together, His life crowned by His death. If this is so, then no other part of our religion, even though it may be a necessary part of the working system, must be allowed to come between us and that which is most essential. This implies that dogma is not to be allowed to interfere with criticism; we must study the Gospels and the other parts of the New Testament in a position of perfect liberty, with a view to finding in them not a preconceived doctrine about Christ, but Christ as He actually was and taught and influenced His followers. It also follows that we cannot accept any doctrine which involves a different attitude towards God, or any other religious spirit, than that of which Jesus gives us the example; and that any doctrine of which this can be said must be marked by us for removal from the creed when the time comes. What is above all necessary for the continuance among us of a true and living Christianity is that, all hindrances being removed, the sheep should hear the Shepherd's voice. When they hear it, they will not fail to follow Him.

III

THE SOCIAL OFFICE OF RELIGION[1]

If the question is asked, What is the Church, and for what end does the Church exist in the world? we hear at least two very definite answers. In the first place, there is that view of the matter which established itself early in the Christian world, and is held more widely in Christendom than any other, that the Church is a divine institution, called into existence at a certain point of time, invested from that time forward with a divine authority, and equipped with all that is necessary to make her the sole and efficient channel of heavenly influence to mankind. Her Scriptures, her creed, her priesthood, and her sacraments are all given from above, and possess inviolable sanctity; her authority flows in an unbroken line of succession from Christ and His apostles; it extends all over the world, and ought to be accepted by all. According to the High Church view, the duty of the individual to the Church is simply that of obedience to a constitution and laws which are perfectly definite and unmistakable; and the Church owes no duty to the world but that of carrying out in it, with consistency and with energy, her own system.

The view commonly held among Protestants is very different. Here less is said about the Church general,

[1] A paper read to the First Conference of the National Church Union, held in Glasgow, 3rd December, 1897.

more about the Church in a particular place. The historical system does not count for so much; the congregation of faithful individuals is the chief thing. To the Protestant, the Church is primarily the assemblage of those who are elect, of the saved, and she exists chiefly for the end of confirming the salvation of her members and of saving the souls of others. Preaching is the principal function of the Church; and the object of preaching is the salvation of sinners and the edification of saints.

A third view of the Church is coming to the front at the present day, and is likely to be much heard of. It is, that the Church has an important function to fulfil towards society. She is called to act as a centre where all classes, all professions, all interests, all views can meet and feel themselves on common ground. She should have sympathy with all, and be able to help all by her inspiration. In the parish church the parish should realise the solidarity of its various inhabitants; in the national Church—and all Churches aim at being in this sense national—the nation should see a true reflection of its manifold effort, and should be reminded of ideals and aims in which all can share, and towards which each, according to his position and his gifts, can make some contribution.

While the High Churchman looks at religion from the point of view of the Church, and makes the institution and its rites an end in themselves to which the individual is subordinate; and while the Low Churchman thinks, in the first place, of the individual, of the soul which needs salvation or has found it; the third view thinks principally of the society in which the Church is set to act, and of what she can do for that society.

I have nothing to say against any of these views. They are not altogether conflicting with each other: there are

probably few, if any, in a country where thought is active, who hold any one of them to the entire exclusion of the others. I shall not enter on the question of the relation to each other of these views of the Church ; and I would not be thought to undervalue that view of her which is based on the mystery of her origin, or that which represents her as inspired like the Master Himself by love for the perishing souls of men, if I turn from these to that view of the Church which regards her as a power called to operate on society for ideal ends. He who came to seek and save the lost, aimed also throughout His ministry at the reformation of the Jewish commonwealth as He saw it around Him, and at the building up of a new kingdom of heaven upon earth. A pious and learned German professor has lately written a large book to prove that the building up of this kingdom of heaven on earth is the main task of Christianity, and that the essence of our religion does not consist in the doctrine of its creeds but in its social ideal and endeavour. I would scarcely go so far as Dr. Kaftan. But I certainly think that we have good warrant and example if, in a society founded for the purpose of theological study, we try to find answers to the questions—

What is the Church called to be to society?
What difficulties lie in the way after fulfilling that office? and
In what direction should we look for the means to overcome these difficulties?

May I without offence set out on this inquiry from a chapter to be read in that great book which Providence is now opening up to us in the wider study of human religion? If we look back to primitive times, we see religion occupying a place in society very different from

that which it occupies now: not that it then influenced the community less than it does now, but very greatly more. And though the state of matters to which I refer has passed away, and can never be recalled as it was then, yet it may very well have something to teach us even now as to what religion can do for man. If you read the books of Judges and Samuel, omitting the passages which criticism declares to reflect the ideas and usages not of the early but of later periods, you find religion occupying what appears to us to be a very peculiar position in society. It inspires all social and natural festivals; it calls into activity the arts of poetry, music, dancing, architecture, decoration; it arbitrates in quarrels; it solves every practical difficulty in which a man may find himself; it summons the tribes to war, and awakens their vigour when the nation has been slumbering. In the Homeric poems you find the same state of matters. Here also religion pervades the whole of life; Church and State are not two but one; the same person offers sacrifice, dispenses justice, fosters the arts and leads to war, in virtue of his kinship to the gods and by the authority which the gods confer and the people allow. In many of the Psalms, also, we find that every art known to Israel is summoned to contribute to the splendid movement of worship, while that worship acts as a direct stimulus to every kind of activity in which the people are engaged. The whole people act as one; the worship which brings them together sends them forth again filled with a common spirit, whether to agriculture or to battle or to happy family life. All is done with and for God. There is no conflict between Church and State, the two being as yet undistinguished from each other. There is no jealousy between religion and science, or between religion and art, even the art of dancing; and no occasion

as yet to adjust the claims of religion with that of common life, because there is no divorce as yet between them.

That condition of affairs belongs to the childhood of the world, and childhood, as we know, once left behind, cannot be brought back again. Perhaps if we entirely realised what was involved in that interpenetration of religion with everything that was done in the community, we should not wish to recall it. It involved an unchangeable fixity in every department of life. As everything was part of religion, and religion followed customs which were fixed and unalterable, nothing could be changed, and no progress was possible. The religious interests of the individual met with small consideration; the individual was of value not for his own sake or by himself alone, but as a member of the tribe which served the God according to old tradition. We would not recall that state of matters; and yet in the picture thus brought before us of a social unity in which religion linked together all the members of the commonwealth, and inspired them for their various duties, there is surely some lesson which may still instruct us. As the idea of the child became the task and lifelong effort of the grown-up man, so we may see perhaps in the religious unity of early society a vision which, as it can never fail to appeal to our minds, we must perforce labour to realise. As it was then, so at the root of the matter it is still. Religion is now, as then, the fixed centre of society, to which men of all kinds must come if they are to realise their unity. At harvest festival and at jubilee celebration we see religion act thus in the most natural way; but what comes to the surface at such times is true, not only occasionally, but always. The division of religion into different churches obscures and confuses this operation of piety, divorcing the motives of worship from those of

citizenship, with which they naturally and originally are most closely allied; yet it is still true that religion alone has power to unite together all the members of the commonwealth. Religion is able to do this because it is of the deepest interest to all; it is the only ideal thing that every one cares for. Every one cares about the origin from which he is sprung, and about the end to which he is to come at last; everyone recognises as his brothers those who have sprung from the same origin with himself and are looking forward to the same goal. The rite or word or symbol, therefore, in which men see expressed their oneness with the Parent of their race, unites them as nothing else can with those who also partake of it or hear it. The ordinance which thus connects men with the same unseen source of energy and of hope, that, I say, is the one ideal thing which all men care for, learned or unlearned, gifted or dull; and the union with our brothers and sisters, which appeals so powerfully to all our hearts, is so simple, so elemental in its nature, that it admits of being transmuted into any form of human energy. Like sunshine or like bread it can lend force to any activity, whether that of the loom or of the plough, of the desk or of the battlefield. If that is true still, as in the earliest days, then it is clear that the ideas suggested to us by the circumstances of early society as to the function of religion are not mere curiosities devoid of any substantial value, but are ideas which we still hold, even if we seldom realise them, and by which we may still live. To us, as to our earliest ancestors, religion is the one agency which is capable of inspiring men of different characters and engaged in different pursuits with a common enthusiasm. It is its function to combine all the forces of the community in the service of the unseen Power from which all alike feel that they are

derived, and in the pursuit of the ideal aim that Power prescribes to them. It sends them forth with encouragement to their various tasks, and after working in their different fields they come back again to unite at the same centre. That is as true nowadays as in the childhood of the world. Primitive society gives us a simpler and clearer illustration than can now be seen of the working of the principle: the principle itself has not changed, and cannot change.

In practice, however, we do not observe that religion now is to the world what it was wont to be. It now occupies a different position in the social fabric, and exerts its influence in a different way. And the reason of this is to be found in the fact that, instead of being diffused throughout the whole of life, and being the concern of all, religion has gathered itself up into a special place of its own, and has been made the concern of a special class. After it has organised itself in an institution apart from the State and from other activities of society, it can no longer act on the community in the same way as before. When a church is formed, a body called out of the world and led by men who are set apart from the world to devote themselves to the service of the Deity—when this happens, then those who are left outside are necessarily to some extent deprived of the religious functions which by ancient custom they had exercised. Instead of being every one's business, religion is now the business of that class which has special charge of it, and there is inevitably a tendency to leave it in their hands. This may be seen very distinctly in the history of the religion of Israel. The finding of the law in the temple under Josiah, and the concentration of the priesthood and of worship at Jerusalem, brought about the cessation of sacrifice and festival

in the country districts. Then began in that religious history of which we are the heirs the new system which in many of its features continues to this day. The Christian priesthood may not have arisen out of the Jewish; but there is a strong likeness between the two. In each case the result of the system was that society was divided into priesthood and laity: religious acts ceased to be the spontaneous expression of a community acting under a common impulse in accordance with well-known custom, and were done instead by the clergy, according to a ritual known and understood perhaps only by them. Another feature of the separate institution of religion, which has become more pronounced in Christianity than ever it was in Judaism, is that the religious act is no longer allowed to speak for itself, and is no longer left open to all who are willing to join in it, but that a doctrine is added to it, often a doctrine which obscures its original and natural meaning, and that belief in the doctrine is made a condition of joining in the act. A set of sacred books is also added to the apparatus of religion: the interpretation of these books calls for a class of experts, and the common man is more and more shut out from taking any independent part in sacred things, and reduced to rely, not only in his religious acts, but in his thoughts and aspirations also, on the aid of the professional class. When this change takes place, religion, standing out before the eyes of all as a separate department of life, is found to have critics, and perhaps even opponents. Church and State come to confront each other in a rivalry which centuries do not suffice to adjust. Other interests which have also set up independent establishments of their own compete with religion for public regard—there is a conflict between religion and science, between religion and art. Instead of being that social

activity which embraced and combined all the others, religion now appears to be only one out of a number of co-ordinate functions of society: the Church is spoken of in the same category with the law, medicine, science, the fighting services. Instead of being as formerly the mother of all human activities, and keeping an open house where all her children meet and are at peace under her wing, religion has stepped down among her children as if she herself were one of their number.

That is a necessary feature, at which it would indeed be foolish to repine, of the growth of human society. When the mind of a nation awakens to the consciousness of its powers, and sees the various departments of thought and of achievement opening before it, each in a wellnigh infinite vista, a process of specialisation necessarily takes place, and the different professions start on their several careers. One department of activity after another organises itself independently and begins to occupy exclusively a whole class of men. It would be strange, indeed, if religion had proved an exception to this general law of human growth; nor could religion itself have flourished, if it had been left to the spontaneous action of the multitude. The regular observance of solemn services, on a scale adequate to the greatness and awfulness of God, which the nation is awaking to discover, the development of the doctrine about God and His past dealings, the editing and explanation of religious books, the adjustment of the code of conduct implied in the theology, and the propagation of the truth among the mass of the people—none of these works, which are all so necessary if religion is to have an assured and elevated position in the world's esteem, could ever have been done without the life-long efforts of whole classes of men, called apart and

devoted to the task. Without such labour and devotion religion never could have flourished. In stormy periods it would be pinched and hustled out of existence but for its bands of stalwart defenders. And even in ordinary times God, to speak in rough human fashion, would not appear so great, nor the divine laws so holy, nor the divine comforts and graces so sweet and satisfying to the minds of myriads of lay worshippers, if He were not thus served. Any one who is not a Quaker will admit it as beyond question that religion requires, for its proper cultivation and development, the services of a set of men specially dedicated to that end.

But while the separate organisation of religion secures for mankind these immense advantages, the evils and drawbacks connected with it are also great and palpable. Any class of men to whom a special department of activity is intrusted is apt to develop a narrow and professional way of thinking, and to regard its work from a special and exclusive point of view. Religion has by no means escaped this danger. To trace the abuses which in one nation and another have sprung from nothing but the earnestness and intensity of the class of men discharging sacred functions, would be a very far-reaching and a most ungrateful task. The great instances which occur to us most readily are those of the Jewish scribes, of the Brahmanic priesthood, and of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. In these instances we see at once how apt a sacred class is to form unduly logical and narrow theories about the service of God, and to lose sight as they do so, or even to trample under foot, broad human interests of which, if they represented the Deity aright, they should have been the foremost champions. The very sacredness of the functions they administer exempts them to a large extent

from criticism, and enables them to elaborate their system with less interference than would be offered in any other branch of affairs. They go great lengths in working out the principle they have adopted into a consistent and highly organised system; and if religion were a matter for its professional votaries alone, they would, no doubt, be right enough. But while they are busy carrying out their principle into every possible detail, it is apt to be found that the apparatus they have brought to such a pitch of perfection is ceasing to answer the practical ends of religion for large classes of the people. While the rite and the doctrine are being refined so highly, it may be found that the religion itself is withering and dying, till it ceases to bring to the simple and to those engaged in the work of the world any assurance of the presence and the help of God. Instead of inspiring it has begun to fetter and paralyse human effort; it is no longer uniting society, but rather producing the most portentous conflict of interests and views. There are various way in which religion may thus drift out of the current of national development, and cease to fulfil its proper function in society. Doctrines may be clung to which are not on a level with the ethical standards prevailing in the community. Or science, which the world is welcoming as full of light, may be held at arm's length by the Church, and the impression be created that the Church does not wish the true facts to be known, whether about geology or about the books of the Bible, and thus the Church may fall out of favour with those who have a high regard for truth. Or she may attempt not merely to inspire but to regulate human life, and carry her regulation so far as to bring about an intolerable tyranny. Attempts have also been witnessed to bring forth again the religious beliefs and methods of days long past, and to

thrust them on the people as the good old way, from which there should never have been any departure. Or the Church may simply grow cold, and while still clinging to her rites and her theology, may cease to make them, as they once were, the living channel of hope and courage to mankind.

These are some of the evils connected, no doubt inevitably, with the separate organisation of religion, and the institution of a special class to discharge religious functions. These evils are met now and then by reformations. The people of every free country are well aware what the true end of religion is, and are able to see when that end is not being served. In every reformation there is a tendency to dispense with the clergy, and to reinstate the individual in the religious functions which have been withdrawn from him. The reformers of the sixteenth century laid very little stress on the institution of a clergy, but insisted on the universal priesthood of all Christians, a position which has by no means been lost sight of. Only a few small bodies of Christians, however, have gone so far as to give up altogether the institution of the regular ministry. If the ordinances of religion are to be effectively attended to, and are to command the respect of the community, Christians generally have felt that a class of men must be set free from the claims of labour and commerce, and bidden to act for the community in religious matters.

The question, therefore, with which we are now confronted is, how the evils and dangers to religion which are so apt to accompany the existence of a professional class of ministers can be avoided. In the early world we find religion to be a matter in which a whole community moved and acted in concert: it was every one's business, and every one bestirred himself about it, and in consequence it made

itself felt in every one's pursuits and in the whole of his life. Now religion is removed from the common man and committed to the professional man, and the common man in consequence leaves it to a large extent to the professional, and does not feel it to be his own business. How is religion to be restored to the common man? how can he be made to feel more than he is apt to feel that the worship of God is his business, that he has some contribution to bring to it, and that it has something to say to him not only as a member of the Church and as an individual liable to spiritual aspirations and spiritual terrors, but also as a citizen, as a craftsman, as a man of letters, or whatever the office may be which he fills in the community?

That is obviously a very large question, and only one or two aspects of it can here be touched upon. I would venture to suggest, in the first place, that if religious acts are to become what they were at first and ought to be, not the acts of a special class or of a limited number of fervent believers, but the acts of communities, moving spontaneously with one mind together, no unnecessary barriers should be set up around them. Such a barrier is undoubtedly erected by the maintenance of a set of beliefs more or less difficult as a condition, tacit or expressed, of Church membership. Religion is primarily a set of acts which the worshippers do together—acts connected no doubt with certain implied beliefs, but by no means implying that these beliefs should be elaborately defined or explicitly stated or formally concurred in by all the worshippers. The acts entering into Christian worship, for example, are older and simpler, and in themselves far more pregnant with meaning than the beliefs which have come to be connected with them. To insist, as is done by the recitation of a creed at acts of worship, that no one can

properly take part in them unless he can utter as his own that interpretation of them which the theologians of the Church after infinite debate agreed upon, that is very unduly to curtail their meaning, and unjustly to fence round as private that which is by its nature public property. Nor are the interests of the community served where the ministers of religion are bound to a creed which does not represent the living convictions of the day. A common belief, no doubt, those must hold who are to cultivate religious communion with each other. But to many it appears that belief has bulked too largely in Church life, and that too little weight has been allowed to what is of more importance, the desire to co-operate in the observances of religion and to lead the life which it requires. A little belief will do if it be hearty and practical: the words of Christ Himself are ample warrant for that statement. Religion will be much stronger if it is taken for granted that those who wish to serve the Deity believe in Him. And if a creed is necessary, there is a form of words belonging to Christianity which expresses the deepest Christian convictions, and which no one I have heard of ever felt to be of the nature of a fetter. The Lord's Prayer is older than even those short creeds found in the Epistles, that Jesus is the Christ, and that Jesus Christ is Lord. I would have it considered, therefore, in the first place, that every man is to be welcome to the rites of the Church who wishes to take part in them and to lead the life. In addition to these qualifications, the ministers of religion must of course have a special education in its history and practice. If a belief is wanted, and if it is to be of such a quality that it shall not deter any class of earnest-minded men, and that it shall be uttered by all with conviction and enthusiasm, the early creed might serve,

that Jesus is Lord and Christ. When all are declared to be welcome to our worship who acknowledge Jesus as their Master, and can say from the heart the prayer He taught us, then only shall we have taken up the right and the truly evangelical position, and opened the doors of our Churches to all Christians. In this way the Church may become truly national: she may be as wide as the Christian nation, and reflect and embrace all that is good in the nation—an object which all the Churches no doubt desire to attain.

In the second place, we may look for a counteracting influence to the evils of professionalism in religion, to the spread of the conviction—it is growing already, and will grow much more—that men are to be valued, even by the Church, for the work they are doing and the function they are filling in the community. When the Church seriously endeavours to be as wide as the community, and to reflect the position and aspirations of the whole of the people, she will feel that her worship, to be complete, must be the offering of all, at least, who are doing any useful work or playing any important part in the country. Ideally, religious worship expresses in symbolical acts all that the nation is earnestly thinking, attempting, and desiring: the studies of scholars, the discoveries of men of science, the imaginations of art, the adjustments of government and of law, the skill of the mechanic, the generosity of the rich and the sympathy of the poor—all enter into it. In worship the efforts of every class and every industry are combined and offered to the Deity. This is not an ideal only; at least it is an ideal which will not suffer itself to be forgotten, and which, where love of God and love of country are both felt, we cannot but endeavour to make real and actual.

Worship is not an act done by officials alone who are set apart for the purpose, and it is not rightly performed when those engaged in it consider that they have left the world outside, and that the concerns of their individual souls are all they have come there to consider. Worship, to answer to its idea and aim, is the act of the community, each member of it bringing as his contribution that which he is or does for the body, each member carrying away with him from the meeting with God and his brethren new devotion and energy for the task which his fellow-men expect him to perform for them. And it ought, therefore, to be understood that in church men and women are valued not only for the thoughts they think together on Sunday, but for the different parts they are playing in the world during the week. If any class stays away from church, the service will be so far defective which the Church offers to God. Though the building is packed from floor to ceiling, yet the congregation does not represent the community fully —there is a defect which nothing can make good in the assembly and the sacrifice. All are wanted there—the ploughman, who fills so important a part in the national economy, the factory-worker, and the tradesman and the artisan, without whom we should be so sadly at a loss: the Church cares for them because they are necessary members in the fabric of the Christian people. The doctor, the lawyer, the teacher, we want also, and the man of letters, the journalist, and the student, even the specialist in natural science, since such studies also contribute to the truth we go to church to hear. Worship is the act of all these together, and they must all come to it, or it will be in so far defective.

Signs are not wanting that the Church, in more than one of its branches, is beginning to awaken to a better

conception of her office than the old one—that she is called to impose a difficult doctrine of her own upon reluctant minds. Should she open her eyes to the great hope that she may yet embrace in herself and combine in her acts of worship every activity of the Christian people, she might to some extent recover the position which religion occupied originally in human society. If religion could rise to the idea that she is not the competitor or rival of any legitimate human interest, but that she is the mother of them all, and can alone provide that home where they can all meet and be at one; if instead of seeking to impose a yoke on the world she could make it her aim to encourage and inspire the world in all its manifold pursuits, her place would never be disputed or denied her. Only we must remember by what means and in what a spirit it is alone possible for religion to hold this central place and wield this dominant influence. The religion which would thus rule in the modern world must not aim at ruling—it must act by suggestion rather than command. In Christ we all know that it is by ministering rather than being ministered to that greatness and rule are to be attained. What does this principle imply as to the true policy of the Church? Is it not that she should endeavour to serve each class of men in the community by trying patiently to understand them, to appreciate their point of view, and to sympathise as far as possible with their conflicts, desires, and aims? In this way the Church might recover her position as the centre to which all bring their treasures, and from which all receive according to their needs; as the union of those who know, and those who are strong, and those who have skill, and those who have wealth—of all the classes and pursuits and interests of the community, including those, perhaps always the greater number, whose chief qualifica-

tion for her meetings is their helplessness and need of grace.

Our discussion has led us to conclude that, in order to be to society what she ought, the Church should take down her doctrinal fences, and should then act on the conviction that all the people in a Christian country belong to her, and that the Church ought to be representative of all that is thought and done and aimed at in the community by those at least who do not set themselves against her. I would ask, before closing this paper, In what way should the Church, if she cherish such a conception of her office, prepare to discharge it?

I should say that the Church would ill prepare herself to fill such a position if she allowed the study of the Bible or of theology to fall, however little, into neglect, or if she gave any encouragement to her preachers to give up in the pulpit those themes which are of interest to all human souls, for the sake of discussion on matters affecting a particular class, or the relation of the classes to each other. It rarely happens that the Church can do good by actively dealing with matters which are agitated in society: the Church must keep herself above disputes in which the combatants on both sides are her children, and she can do most good by remaining on her own ground. Her ground is that intercourse of men with God, and of men with each other in the light of God, from which men come forth with fresh energy to be applied in any of a thousand ways. The great facts of the new life of man with God brought to us in Christ—of forgiveness, of atonement, of progress through sacrifice and through sympathy with sacrifice—these can never be displaced in favour of matters regarding which men have much less in common. What is fitted to

interest and stimulate all, and to renew the forces of all men's souls and render them more capable of effort and devotion, that is first of all necessary to a religion which is to be the rallying-point of the community. And to deal faithfully with these matters the ministers of religion must be masters of their own special studies. The educated and intelligent are an important part, to say no more, of those who have to be considered, and in their eyes religion must suffer if its representative makes mistakes about the history and literature of the Bible, which if he has not studied some Biblical criticism he is sure to do. Even the less educated have a right to claim not to be taught things which they will have to unlearn in a few years. Christian doctrine also must be studied if the preacher is not to misrepresent the beliefs of past ages or to misapply those of the present. In the field of devotion the effective minister must not only have made himself familiar with the best devotional work of past ages, but have applied himself to the problem of finding new and living channels for the devotion of the present age—expressions at once true to the manifold life of our day, and sufficiently chaste and solemn to be the vehicle of common prayer.

All this the clergy must have, who are to act as the centre and mouthpiece of Christian communities of our age. But they require a great deal more. They ought to know something of everything, and their theology they ought to know not only as a special study by itself, but in its relation to other studies: how else can they know in what way the interests of various classes of men are related to the central interest which is expressed in worship? Hence it is proper that the candidates for the ministry should pass through a university, where they come in contact with students of science and medicine and law and

literature, and may learn to understand the views and motives that enter into these pursuits. To withdraw the candidates for the ministry from those of their own age who are preparing themselves for other callings, and thus cause them to regard themselves even so early as a class apart from other men, that is directly to unfit them for the part they will afterwards have to play of understanding all kinds of views and influencing all classes of men.

If, when suggestions are invited for the improvement of the curriculum of the students of the Church, I may be allowed to make one small suggestion, it would be that before or after licence our candidates should have some instruction in technology and sociology. A minister ought to know something of the trades and occupations of his people, and of the position which each trade and occupation holds in the national economy. When labour troubles arise he should at least understand what is going on. His true sphere is the spiritual; but spiritual influence has to be applied in definite earthly circumstances, and he should be able to see when there is such defiance of necessary economic laws as must lead to disaster, and should have so much knowledge of trade practice and arrangements as to recognise the fitting opportunity, should it arise, for saying a word of warning or of peace.

And after the servants of religion are educated and launched on their career, the Church should not over-regulate their activity, but leave them to find out for themselves how they can best serve the ends of religion in their parishes. The character and independence of her ministers is an important element of the strength of the Church. They can be real leaders of their people only if they are seen to be speaking and acting from their own conviction and impulse. To drill the shepherds of the country into

uniformity, if that were possible, would be to destroy their efficiency as shepherds. The Church, therefore, which desires to be well served by its ministers in their parishes, and to act through them as the leaven and the salt of society, ought first of all to make the position of her servants attractive to a superior class of young men, by providing them with adequate maintenance and imposing on them no restrictions but such as are obviously necessary; and she should then abstain from unnecessary interference and dictation. By pursuing such a policy the Church would be most certain to be served with enthusiasm and loyalty, and would have the best possible guarantee that her ministers would be kept by their respect for her and their *esprit de corps* among each other from any disaffection, and from extravagance either of ritual or of doctrine.

I have now set before you my views of what a living Church should seek to be to society and to the country These ideas have long haunted my mind, and I am grateful to the National Church Union for this opportunity of giving them expression. Yet I believe that these ideas are not mine only, but that they are entering into many minds, and by many will not be regarded as too speculative or unpractical. The Churches themselves are awakening to the consciousness of the claims society has on them. The fact of their inquiring into the condition of the people is a most hopeful omen in this respect; and we must desire that these inquiries should be carried on and extended in other directions besides those they have already so well pursued. I would now draw this paper to a close, and would in doing so remind myself and you that the duty of the Church and of her ministers has other elements than those which we have been considering. We must not let

ourselves be so absorbed in contemplating the social function of the Church as to forget that we owe a duty to truth as well as to society, to individuals as well as to the commonwealth, to our Church as well as to our country, to Christ Himself as well as to our fellow-Christians, and to the spiritual world as well as to the concrete world now surrounding us. We can never do good to the world by flattering it or by consenting to forget that there is a better world than it is. To that better world it is that we wish this one to be conformed; it is for that end that we feel called to understand as well as possible what this world is, and what each class is doing in it, and may rightly be called to do for its improvement and salvation.

IV

SERMONS AND PRAYERS WRITTEN FOR THE SERVICES OF THE UNIVERSITY CHAPEL, ST. ANDREWS

INTERCESSION

O God our heavenly Father, we come before Thee in the name of Jesus Christ, Thy well-beloved Son, and we entreat Thee to shine upon us this day with Thy favour. We bless and praise Thee for the knowledge Thou hast given us of Thyself and for the desire Thou hast implanted in our heart to seek for Thee and find Thee. When we have Thee, O Lord, all things are ours, things past, the world that is around us now, and things to come. Grant to us, O Lord, as we enquire in Thy temple, to behold something of Thy beauty and to be sure that Thou art ours, and that we are Thine.

Forgive us all our sins and trespasses, O Lord: and set us free if it be Thy will from all dark thoughts and from all worldly entanglements and vain desires, that we may walk with confidence on the road that lies before us.

O God, who hast called us away from the toil and traffic by which others win their bread, and enabled us to devote ourselves to the pursuit of learning in this place, give us grace to devote ourselves with all our heart to that which we have undertaken.

Help us to remember those to whom such opportunities have not been given, and to strive that we may be able to do something for their help and comfort. Shine into our minds, O Lord, with Thy pure light: may our eye be clear and our heart sympathetic, that we may understand Thy creatures and Thy laws and counsels.

Bless, O Lord, the work and study that is set before us in this place. Make light to shine on the page we read and on the objects we examine. Give us a single eye and an honest purpose in all we do, that in the least of Thy works we may still discern the great design which holds them all together. Keep far from us all vanity and conceit, all mean and selfish aims and views, and give us a heart to put Thee first always and to do all for Thy glory.

And Thine shall be all the glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. AMEN.

"Now I Paul myself intreat you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ." II. CORINTHIANS, X. 1. (R.V.)

THE Apostle Paul does not often appeal to the human example Christ set us; but he appears to do so here. His relations with the Church of Corinth, of which the Epistle is full, were not very happy. It had seriously misjudged him, and had given ear too readily to what his opponents had to say about him; it believed all kinds of malicious rumours about him, and accused him of every weakness, every crime that was possible to one in his position. He has a good deal to say about that still before he brings his Epistle to a close. But at this point he makes a solemn personal request to the Corinthians; makes it in his own name, not in the name of Paul and Timothy, who are said at the beginning to be the writers of the Epistle. "I,

Paul, myself intreat you," he says. And how does he enforce his entreaty, what does he point to, to give force to it? "By the meekness and gentleness of Christ," he says. He adjures them to look at the matters about which he and they are at variance, in the same way in which Christ would have looked at them, and to bring meekness and gentleness to bear on them as Christ would have done. Christ would not treat any man, he means the Corinthians to understand, as you have been doing. He would not be harsh and bitter to anyone, nor be ready to think evil, even of one about whom bad reports were brought to Him ; He would trust him meekly, as if He had no right to judge of the case till He knew more about it, and heard the man's own story. He would treat him gently ; gentleness perhaps hardly renders the meaning of the Greek word here ; Matthew Arnold suggested the translation 'sweet reasonableness.' Christ would not judge a culprit without taking some trouble to understand the case ; He would do His best to arrive at a kind and reasonable view of the circumstances.

The Apostle, you see, speaks of the Lord in a very natural and human way. There were no written accounts of the Lord's life to point to when he sent this Epistle to Corinth ; but the Corinthians were well aware, as Paul was well aware, what kind of spirit the Lord showed when He was on the earth. It was common knowledge for all Christians how the Lord acted to people who were accused to Him. Everyone knew that He was never in haste to condemn such persons, and never flew into a passion at them, nor assumed any air of superior virtue: He tried to see what was wrong, with accused or with accusers, and He would deal with it firmly indeed, but calmly and reasonably.

That is not a great deal to say about the Lord when one appeals from the hasty judgment of men to His calm judgment. The Apostle might have put it much higher; he does put it much higher in the other Epistles; he speaks of the justice Christ will show us when we come to stand at last before His judgment seat, of the perfect understanding He will show, of His sympathy, His love, even to the erring. Here, instead, he appeals to the common knowledge Christians had of Christ's kindly and sensible way of dealing with those who were accused to Him. 'I intreat you by the meekness and reasonableness of Christ, —He was always fair, always calm: will you not be the same?' The Apostle thus departs here to some extent from the principle he lays down in I. Corinthians, that he would know nothing at Corinth but Jesus Christ and Him crucified: he knows here and speaks of, not Jesus crucified, but Jesus as He lived and went about among men; he appeals to the example of Jesus, set up in His human life, and urges the Corinthians to take that example before their minds and allow it to influence them. As a rule, Paul only speaks of Christ as the being who gave up His heavenly glory and came down to the earth and died that our sins might be forgiven and that we might have hope of the life to come. It was Christ dying and rising again that he felt himself called to preach; in all his Epistles he dwells chiefly on Him, and urges us to be united to Christ in His death and in His resurrection, to die with Christ that we may live with Him. But here it is the human Christ he holds up for our imitation, Christ as He walked about in Galilee and had interviews with men and women and was called to pronounce sentence on them and did judge them in a kindly and unassuming human fashion. 'Let me urge you,' he says, 'to follow that example, to

put away the passion and venom with which you have been judging me, to judge me, with all my faults, as Jesus would have done.'

Let the first lesson, then, which we take from our text be this: that we should hold before us Jesus as He lived and acted on the earth; that we should allow the example to influence our minds and our conduct. There is the more reason for this in our case than in the case of the Corinthians, that we have more information about the early life of Christ than the Corinthians could have. The four Gospels are in our hands, and we can read them and see for ourselves what kind of person Jesus was and what impression He produced on His friends and on those outside the circle of His friends. Limiting ourselves to the point Paul speaks of in the text, the Gospels are full of incidents in which Jesus displays His meekness and reasonableness in judging of men and women and their actions. He is surrounded all His life by men who lose their patience and give way to passion, men who pass hasty and ill-considered judgments and are bent on driving away from their Master those who appeal to Him. He, on the other hand, always shows Himself superior to such passions and outbursts; He will not have people driven away from Him who are asking for His help for themselves or their children. He sees deeper than His disciples do into the hearts of those who come to Him; He shows a broad sympathy with their desires; and He at once speaks the word which shows true appreciation of the case and is felt by all to be right and just. It is not necessary to name the special instances of this; you will remember them; if not, it will be good for you to look for them. We cannot forget how often He took the side of a woman who tried to get to Him and found obstacles put in her

way ; we cannot wonder that women followed Him about the country and ministered to Him of their substance, when we remember how often He justified them against attacks on their conduct—conduct that was enthusiastic rather than practical. Like Socrates, like Guatama, like Confucius, like many another sage, Jesus is displayed as always calm and great, as always seeing to the bottom of a problem that is put before Him, as always prepared to say the right word that ends dispute. It is good for us to bring ourselves in contact with the great men of our race, and to seek to catch some of their spirit ; in the case of Jesus Christ it is supremely good for us to do so. We can always trust Him ; we can feel that in each of His words we have the whole of Him, that it comes from His heart and is a part of that for which He died. We should study the Gospels, then, and seek to know for ourselves not only the meekness and gentleness of Christ, but also His courage and truthfulness, His devotion to duty, His recognition of the claims of all, even to the weakest and the worst, His determination that the reign of Satan should come to an end and that the Kingdom of God should come, His unshaken faith, His unfailing kindness.

It is quite possible to study all this, even without any special preparation or learning. The first three Gospels are the simplest of books, written in the language of the common people of their day and capable of being translated readily into any language. They are, moreover, to be depended on for the information they give ; many of the stories in them were written down within thirty years of the death of Christ, many are based on accounts given by people who had seen and heard what is recorded. Some portions of the Gospels, indeed, are later, and cannot be accepted quite as they stand, but the lover of truth can with

a little study find out for himself what in the Gospels is true history; the rest he can leave aside. Of the teaching of Christ, the Parables and the Sermon on the Mount are most surely to be relied on as really spoken by our Master. It is good for us to read these books and to find out for ourselves the Person who moves and speaks in them. If we do so we shall find ourselves conversing and becoming intimate with one who is far above us, as He was far above His disciples and contemporaries, in many of the highest qualities of human nature, who knew what God is and what man is called to be, and devoted Himself entirely to doing God's will and helping His fellowmen. Men were all alike to Him; He could comfort the poor; He could sympathise with and pity the rich with all their cares; He could deal with a fellow-Jew or with a Gentile man or woman with equal ease; He knew what all men really wanted and required, and could help them to follow after it with better hope. He was much loved; He was at once so strong and so kind; many were found who were ready to forsake all they had to follow Him, many who, after He was dead, were willing to die for His cause, many who thought Him a divine being, because in Him they felt they came in contact with God Himself, and that in Him the eternal light and love had come down to shine upon their lives. Though He is so great, it will not discourage us to go to Him and make Him our companion. He is full of encouragement even to the frail and erring; in His company we shall grow stronger and truer men and women; we shall learn to part with our prejudices and to put on some at least of His gentleness and meekness.

Of gentleness and meekness let us speak in concluding, since they are the qualities the Apostle says are to be seen in Christ, and which the Corinthians are to imitate as they

turn their minds to Him. It is an easy criticism of the Apostle Paul, that he himself shows no great example of these qualities in what follows of his Epistle. He seems to be appealing in our text to a standard he knows he will not reach himself, for a few verses after the appeal he speaks of his opponents in such pointed and passionate terms as his best friends find hard to justify. Is there a kind of despair in his appeal as he urges the Corinthians to follow an example he feels to be far beyond himself? When passions are aroused, when we are in the midst of conflict, or see a conflict coming on which we fear that nothing can avert, then it is hard to be meek and gentle; and yet it is just then that these qualities are called for and that the man who desires to save his soul will most desire them. They are not to be had for nothing. They are something more than mere dullness and apathy; they come, not from having no spirit in one's breast, but from having tamed and subdued one's spirit so that one is master in one's house. So we may judge it was with Jesus Christ Himself. He had great vehemence of character, we sometimes see; indignation could rise high with Him; when He saw injustice or blindness in high places, who could wield such scathing invective? But as a rule He was calm and serene; His invective was never uttered to defend or avenge Himself, only to defend others who were unjustly treated, or to denounce incompetent and cruel rulers. For Himself He would put up with any slight or injury and say nothing about it; He would never urge any claims of His own, nor strike any egotistical attitude. He was always able and ready to judge of anything that came in His way from the point of view of others who were affected by it, and not to scold them or censure them, but as far as possible to help them. That

was no doubt due in part to His own large and sunny nature, but in part it must have been due to the training He had given Himself in His youth; to think little of Himself, and much of what God claimed of Him, what His fellow-men claimed of Him. It was the result of His early self-denial, His repression of selfish views, His habit of humility and reverence towards God and man, that He was able afterwards to say that He was meek and lowly in heart, and that those who came to Him would find Him no hard Master, but would obtain from Him rest for their soul.

Youth is the season for decisions—in youth must be formed the habits of mind which will make us afterwards either a terror to ourselves and to those we meet, or meek and gentle, a joy to ourselves, to others a comfort and shelter.

INTERCESSION

HEAR us, O God, as we pray for our fellowmen. May it please Thee to bless our country with prosperity and peace, and to enlighten and guide those who rule over us.

Guard and inspire Thy Church, we pray Thee, so that all men, both in this and in other lands, may be led into the way of Christ.

Encourage and uphold all good men and women who are seeking to promote Thy Kingdom on earth. Bless all teachers, all students and learners, both here and everywhere, and lead them to the light they seek. Be present to all who are dear to us, here or far away, and help them to know what is good and to follow it with faithful minds.

Have mercy on all who are sick or bereaved, on all who are in darkness, on all who are helpless or forsaken.

Hear us, O Lord, in these and all our prayers which are offered to Thee in the name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Give us, we beseech Thee, O Lord, what we need this day. Forgive us all our sins, we entreat Thee, according to Thine infinite mercy towards us in Jesus Christ, give us true repentance of all that we have done amiss, and set us free from all vain fears and confusing scruples. Give us, most of all, Thy Holy Spirit; and help us to remember that we come from Thee and are going to Thee, and that something of Thine own life dwells in us. While we live in this world, grant that we be not overcome by the world, but may so speak and act as those who seek a better country, even an heavenly. And do Thou supply to us all that is good, O Thou most great and bounteous Lord, through Jesus Christ our Lord. AMEN.

> "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."
>
> MATTHEW vi. 33.

WHAT did Jesus mean by the Kingdom of God, and how did He mean us to seek it, and how are we to apply His words to ourselves?

When He spoke of the Kingdom of God Jesus meant that there was a good time just at hand—a new world in which all injustice and wrong would be at an end, in which the poor would have all their wants supplied, all hunger would be satisfied, all mourning comforted, all mysteries made plain. It was a Kingdom for the good, the resolute, the self-denying, the merciful; God would come down Himself to rule over His people in peace and happiness; those

who were worthy would be with Him. Nothing sordid, nothing ugly, nothing fitted to offend or wound would have any place in that blessed state; all God's promises would be fulfilled in it; all faithful workers would be rewarded; all who had done good and had made sacrifices without meeting recognition would find justice done to them and the divine sympathy awaiting them.

Well, if this was what Jesus meant when He said the Kingdom was at hand, what did He mean when He told His followers to seek the Kingdom? How were they to seek it, where and by what means?

Jesus did not think that the coming of the Kingdom depended on the efforts men might make to bring it on. He never says that men can hasten the Kingdom by what they do; they can only pray to God to hasten it. He never suggests to His followers that they should fight to bring the Kingdom near. No, it is God who is to come with the Kingdom when the time arrives which He has fixed; men can only wait till He shows His hand, and hope for the great event and think about it and long for it and pray for its coming. Even Jesus Himself says He does not know the time or the hour, but only the Father in heaven.

How, then, are men to seek the Kingdom? If nothing they can do will make it appear or hasten it, what is the sense of telling them to seek for it?

Well, what is meant is that they are to try to be fit for the Kingdom when it comes. They cannot accelerate its advent, but they can dwell on the thought of that happier world; they can consider the kind of life that will be lived there, the justice, the kindness, the purity, the meekness and gentleness which its inhabitants must wear. They can let the thought of the Kingdom and all that belongs to it

work on their minds, so that it will exercise more and more power over them and change them in some measure into its own character. They can put away all evil habits and worldly views and low inclinations which are plainly inconsistent with the nature of the Kingdom and cannot dwell in it. They must repent, in the words of Christ's opening proclamation, because the Kingdom of God is at hand; they must be in earnest and make themselves such manner of people that when the Kingdom does appear they will be fit to go into it, and will not be left outside. That is to seek the Kingdom. It is to live as if you were in the Kingdom already to consider that ideal world as the real world for you, the standards of which you must proclaim and hold aloft, the laws of which you must obey.

How can we apply this doctrine of the Saviour about the good time coming and the way in which we ought to seek it, to our own circumstances in this age? For one thing, we do not now believe in the sudden coming of the good time. With Jesus the change to the good time is to take place in a moment—a moment no one can foresee or calculate—everything is to be changed all at once, the old world is to pass away and a new world to begin without any warning or any period of transition. Our ways of thinking in this age make it impossible for us to hold that view. We are compelled by all the habits of mind in which we were brought up to think that one state of the world and of society does not pass suddenly into a different one, but that there are stages of progress, that change is gradual and slow, and that the progress of the future is being quietly prepared in movements which take place, perhaps under the surface, in the present.

But, on the other hand, when Jesus tells us to look forward to a better world, and to place ourselves even now under the influence of the better world to which we aspire, when He tells us to seek it by adopting its standards as our own just now, and practising its customs—in this part of His teaching we feel that there is no subtraction or deduction to be made—we acknowledge His authority and take His words humbly to our heart. It is a religion of hope that He has given us—hope for mankind, hope for ourselves. Its central lesson is that we should believe in the good things God is bringing, and strive to have them near us and to draw them into our own present world. The Christian hope has never been extinguished since Jesus first lighted it before the minds of His followers in Galilee. It has changed its form again and again; sometimes the future vision has taken the form of a populous city; sometimes that of individual converse with God and Christ; sometimes the scene of the Christian hope has been laid on the earth, at other times in a distant heaven. Sometimes it has embraced only a few, sometimes the whole body of the Church. Sometimes it has been thought to begin immediately after death, by many after a long interval. But the hope of a better time coming has, under whatever form, always been there, and has always been a principal part of Christian thought. It is essential to our life as followers of Jesus that we should think there are better things to come than we have yet seen, both for the world and for ourselves as individuals. The best still lies before us; the promises are still to be fulfilled more richly and more completely than has ever been the case as yet; it is still our part to send our thoughts away before us to the future, to lay hold in faith of the better things God has in store for us and to pray to Him to hasten the time. The

worst of all imaginable heresies would be the denial of the hope of Christ, the assertion that the world had come to a standstill and that the happy land that all Christian ages have seen stretching before them is a vain dream.

That we should believe in the Kingdom of God, that is the first thing we have to do as Christian men and women ; we cannot seek it, as the Saviour bids us, if we do not believe in it.

But believing in it is not enough, if we are to fulfil the injunction of the Saviour. We are to seek it ; we must dwell on the thought of it ; we must try to realise it in our minds. We must carry the thought of it along with us in our work and on our journeys, and try to sketch out to ourselves the features of it which specially interest us. We must try to grasp the spirit of that better world that is coming, in which perfect justice and perfect kindness alike prevail. We must picture to ourselves the arrangements it will have, the encouragements it will hold out to all to do their best, the means it will afford for raising the intelligence and the cultivation of all, according to their position and requirements, the provision it will make for learning and for art, for amusements without vulgarity or excess, for religion free from strife and from hypocrisy. It is not only for statesmen and political thinkers to engage in such forecasts, but for all of us. We should all seek to have before our minds some living picture of the better world we long and pray for ; we should contemplate it in such a spirit of faith and hope that we shall be filled with enthusiasm for it and be prepared to sell all that we have in order to purchase it. We should know it so really that we shall say of it, in the words of the hymn,

" For thee, O dear, dear country,
Mine eyes their vigils keep."

This, then, appears to be the meaning of our text for us. We are to think of the better world that is coming in a purely religious way, a purely unselfish way, without any political bias in our contemplation, though, of course, the vision granted to religion must strive to translate itself into practical reality in the political world. But our contemplation must not be undertaken in the interests of any class or party or trade, but in the interest of religion.

What does God want the world and us to be? we have to ask the great Being who is above all classes and parties and trades, who is considerate to all, yet just to all. What does God wish to come about in human affairs? What can we know of the fair face of the better world as He wishes and intends it to be? That vision, in so far as it is granted to us, is what we are to seek, to be in love with, to take for our rule of life, our guiding star.

And the ideal we thus take to our breast will change us to its own nature more and more; it will not suffer us to be unjust here and now, since we are looking forward to a world of perfect justice; it will make us strong to throw off those things in us which belong to the beast rather than to the man, and to strive in every way to make ourselves fit to be citizens of a better world.

We saw at the beginning that our Lord did not tell His disciples that the coming of the Kingdom depended on them or that they had any power to hasten it or bring it on. We shall agree, the more we think of it, that that is the case still. It will be well for us to be very cautious about saying or thinking that anything we do is essential to the designs of Providence. Yet God appoints to each of us his task. Ah! happy he who recognises it as given to him by the Author of his being and devotes himself to do

with all his might the work assigned to him. We cannot tell exactly what the issue of our work will be, but we may be sure that no honest work is done in vain or will be unrewarded.

We may be sure, in conclusion, that the work of this University, which we are now taking up for another session, is work that God appoints us and will bless, if it is done with diligence and with a single eye. The Kingdom which we seek is not a realm of darkness or ignorance, but of light and knowledge; and the increase of light and knowledge must be God's will. The beneficent influence of University study is felt far and wide. The learning we cultivate will lift up many to a more intelligent and freer life; discoveries may be made here which may have a profound result in increasing the power and the well-being of man.

We take up our studies this year with a sense of great encouragement.[1] The eyes of the world have been turned to this University, and we have learned how many friends we have in this and in other lands and what an interest is taken in our history and our doings. May it be given to us to repay all the goodwill that has been shown to us by seeking to make the present and the future of this University worthy of its past, and striving together, while we scorn delights and live laborious days, to build up, in this far corner of the Northern Sea, a solid, a fair and a well-proportioned house of knowledge.

[1] This sermon was preached in the College Chapel just after the Quincentenary celebrations of the University.

INTERCESSION

O give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good: for His mercy endureth for ever.

O Lord, we beseech Thee, look down in Thine infinite pity upon this Thy world, for lo! the day has come and Thy children have awakened to life and to toil and to temptation. O Thou who art the lover of men, let Thy Holy Spirit wait for each one on the threshold of this day and lead him through the hours till evening fall. Like as a father pitieth his children, so dost Thou pity all the woeful and heavy-hearted. Look down on all those who are so soon awaking to their griefs, speak comfortably to them: remember those in pain who must again take up their heavy burden. Look down upon the hungry and the rich, the evil and the good, that in this new day each may find something of Thy mercy, and may give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good, for His mercy endureth for ever.

O God, we lift up our voice to praise Thee this new day. We praise Thee that Thou hast made us and preserved us till now, that Thou dost call us to look out on this splendid and gracious world, that Thou callest us to serve Thee, each in his place. Thou art our portion, O Lord; in Thee is our highest joy; in Thee is all our hope and stay. Give us more and more a heart to turn to Thee and to rejoice in Thee and in Thy works: send to us Thy Holy Spirit more and more, that we may know the direction we should follow in this world and be saved from all perplexities and

needless cares. Forgive us all our sins, O Lord ; assure us of Thy mercy in Jesus Christ our Lord, and grant that we may love Thy law and may be diligent in doing Thy will. And do Thou bless our bodies and our spirits and every part of our life, and cause us to grow and prosper in every good work, and to do something that shall be profitable for our brethren and wholesome for ourselves.

Bless those who are dear to us. Keep them always in Thy love and fear, and supply to them abundantly what is good.

Grant us to hope in Thy name, O Thou source of all creation, and open the eye of our heart to know Thee, that Thou alone art the highest in the highest. Thou dost humble the pride of the haughty, Thou dost raise up the humble and abase the lofty, Thou makest rich and makest poor, Thou dost slay and make alive, Thou seest all the works of men, Thou art the helper of all who are in danger, the Saviour of those in despair.

We beseech Thee, be our help and succour in our time of need. Bless our country, and grant that no weapon formed against her may prosper. Bless our King and Queen and those who counsel them. Grant to them a holy and a brave spirit and a wise discernment. Bless our soldiers and sailors and airmen, especially those who have gone forth from this place to fight for us. Do Thou sustain their courage and forgive all their sins, do Thou heal their wounds and assuage their pains, and comfort them in their anxieties and give them a happy return to their own land. Do Thou care for all widows and orphans and bereaved persons, do Thou open doors to the wanderers, and grant to us, in Thy good time, a lasting peace.

And Thine shall be the glory for ever and ever. AMEN.

"And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."

St. Luke xxii. 31, 32.

The Lord foresees that a grievous trial is coming to His disciples; He uses a powerful figure to indicate what He sees to be impending over them. Satan, the great adversary of human souls and of their souls, has asked God's leave to subject them to a violent temptation, such as human nature can scarcely be expected to withstand. They are to be sifted as wheat, shaken with a violent motion backwards and forwards; events are coming which will act on them in that way, which will deprive them suddenly and entirely of their self-possession, take away their judgment and make them forget all that they ought most to remember. When they are in that grave predicament, they will be carried away to do things they will bitterly regret afterwards. Jesus knows them too well to think that they will stand firm in that unnerving hour; they will prove too weak; the only excuse it will be possible to make for them will be that the trial was too violent, too compelling for man's force to withstand.

So much for the disciples generally; then the Lord turns to Peter in particular, and says how it is to be with him. The Lord recognised on many occasions that Peter was the strongest of His disciples, and that more might be expected of him than of any of the others. Peter was to have the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; he was to be the head-steward who knew where all the stores and all the equipments of the household were, and could unlock the right doors and give out what was needed. On Peter He would build His Church.

But what of Peter in the great trial of which we hear in this passage? The Lord has prayed for him, he says, that his faith fails not. The Lord seems to have been thinking more of His friends than of Himself this last night of His life. We do not find Him, except for one brief hour in Gethsemane, contemplating His own personal trial that was threatening Him so nearly; it is mostly of others that He thinks—of the disciples. It is they whose flesh is weak, though their spirit is willing; it is for Peter He has been praying. And what has He asked for Peter? That his faith may not fail, that he may remain constant in the dreadful and unsettling hour, and not be guilty of any act which he will have to repent bitterly afterwards. And yet that was too much to ask; the Lord knew His Peter too well to think that he could stand upright in the great trial. Peter, too, would fail. And yet, even if he did fail, all was not lost for him. The Lord sees that Peter will be sorry for his great lapse, that he will turn from it. The Authorised Version says, 'when thou art converted'; the Revised Version says, 'when once thou hast turned again.' When that happens—and the Lord is sure it will happen; He knows Peter too well to think that it will not—what is he to do then? Is he to punish himself in some way, to go apart and give himself to a course of self-humiliation? Kings in old times, when they had made a great mistake, would set about building a cathedral, a rich man would build a set of almshouses for the poor; one has heard of pilgrimages to distant places and of those who became monks and nuns to atone for some great sin or mistake. Does the Lord direct His follower to any of these devices for cancelling a sin? Not at all. He does not apparently wish him to dwell much on the denial of which he is going to be guilty; he is not to spend many

tears over it or to scourge himself too much either in body or soul on account of it. He is to turn at once, when he comes back to his true position, to the practical task the Lord puts before him, of strengthening his brethren. They will need it much. It will be hard for them to hold up their heads again and to forgive themselves for their weakness and cowardice and their base desertion of their Master; but Peter is to put courage and strength into them, to keep them together and show them that their cause is not lost entirely, that they have still something to do for Jesus, that they are able to do it, that they ought at once to start to it. That is what Peter is to do when he comes to himself; that will be much better for him and for his brethren than if he brooded ever so long over his disgrace and hid himself all his life thereafter from the face of mankind.

That is what Peter was told to do when he had passed through his trial; and that is what he did. He was the strong man among the disciples, the man most to be depended on, most certain when any great trial came to the company to get the better of it and come back to his usual frame of mind. That was why Jesus gave him the name of Peter, rock, and said He would build His Church on this rock, this Peter.

Peter justifies thoroughly, after the death of Jesus, the confidence here put in him. After the scattering of the disciples, their flight, when their Master was arrested, Peter was the first to come to himself and to realise that the work the disciples had to do for their Master was not over, but only beginning. All the Gospels agree that Peter was the first to have a vision of the risen Christ, and that it was from him that the conviction spread to an ever-increasing number of those who cared for Jesus, that He

was not dead, that He was living and able to do all things for them. So true it was that on him, on his firm character, his clear conviction, on the Peter, the rock in him, the Church was founded, and that he, when he was converted, set to work to do what Jesus had bidden him, to strengthen the brethren.

This is the little picture these verses yield us, a very clear and intelligible picture, of Peter coming to himself and remembering how his Master had spoken to him about the temptation which had in so dreadful a way overcome him. We may hang up that picture along with others in the gallery of religious pieces each of us carries about in his head and turn to it now and then and note what it says to us. We may not ourselves be in the position of Peter, either in respect of the great office he held as the first of the disciples or in respect of his lamentable fall; yet the picture will have much to tell us. It will give us a lesson about the Good Shepherd and the methods He employs to guide His sheep aright and set them free from the perils which threaten them. Even on the last night of His life, when He feels the machinations of the traitor and the malice of his enemies closing around Him, He does not think of Himself; His thoughts are all for the poor sheep He is so soon to leave; how He is to be raised up for them, how they can be nerved and strengthened to help themselves. He is far from bemoaning Himself or pitying Himself. He is ready to bear what may prove to be God's will for Him; with regard to His own fate He is strong, He is calm. If only He could make His disciples strong and calm too; that may be difficult when the great trial comes upon them and Satan sets to frightening and shaking them. How help them then? Those of them

who are strongest must strengthen those who are weaker. And he places before Peter's mind—Peter is the strong one among them—the idea of what he is to try to be to the weaker brethren. "This is what you can do when I am no longer here. Be a strength to them. Encourage them, solve their doubts, set them free from their fears, keep them together, show them what to think and what to do for the cause of their Master."

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." It is a great word, not only because of the circumstances in which it was spoken, but in itself a word to carry with us always, to be reminded by it always of our duty.

When our soldiers went to this war, they were bidden by their officers, and especially by Lord Kitchener, that they were to consider themselves as gentlemen and to act as gentlemen in the various positions in which they would find themselves. They rose to the idea, and have acted all through this long and trying time, like men who followed no mean calling and could do nothing mean; they have shown themselves self-respecting, fearless, generous, gentle warriors. Such is the power of a high ideal uttered with conviction to a man or to an army.

And our text may act on us in the same way. We find ourselves living among people not all of whom are brave, and many of whom have much to bear. Many of them are by nature diffident and cannot regard themselves as being of any importance or as having any clear calling or mission in the world. Many are afflicted with doubt, even on great matters, and doubt is a confusing and weakening companion. And all carry with them memories they would fain get rid of, memories of mistakes and failures and sins. He who takes for his motto the

Saviour's words, *Strengthen thy brethren*, will not want occupation.

Yet the call cannot be put away from us. It is the plain duty of each of us to contribute what he can to the strength of the family in which he was born, and of the greater family of his neighbours and his race. And this, as the Lord intimates, is the true anodyne to help us to forget the sins and errors of the past, and to find instead of these bad visitors, the assurance that we are being borne along in a movement that goes forward and not backward, and that we need not be unhappy. To strengthen, then, even a little, some of those who are living by our side, that is a great reward, and warrants us to think our life has not been useless. We need not announce that we are setting out to do it; it should be done naturally and quietly if they are really to be helped. It cannot be done at all without a cheerful countenance. We can never strengthen others if they do not see that we regard the excursion we are making by their side as a good and well-arranged excursion that will not go wrong. It may be given us to do more—to help the doubts of others by showing that we understand their doubts and that we yet have faith in God and in man, His child. It may be given to us to help the Church and do something to keep alive the public interest in it and love for it, to the comfort and upbuilding of many. We may even be asked for advice, and may hold up to a brother a picture of what we conceive to be his calling, the pursuit to which he ought to give himself. We should try to live to some extent within the thoughts and lives of other people, that when an opportunity occurs in any of these ways to strengthen them and point them to good things in store for them, we may be at hand.

In this way we shall escape, God helping us, from what-

ever there is in our past lives to humiliate and grieve us ; we shall take our place most surely in the forward and upward movement of the world, and lay hold on the Kingdom of Heaven that is coming. It might be given even to a nation that has sadly mistaken the true aim and the right spirit of human life, to repent of its error and to take its place as a friend and not as an enemy, of the surrounding nations, heartily striving to help them forward in good things. May God grant that this awakening, this generous change may come in time to the nation with which we are at war.

May He grant to us at least, by cheerfulness and kindliness, to turn our back upon the shadows of the past, and along with those we strive to strengthen, to direct our faces to the good time that is coming.

PRAYER AT THE CLOSE OF A TERM

We praise Thee, O God, for Thy goodness in bringing us safely to the stage we have now attained in our journey. At the close of this term, we desire to acknowledge thankfully the hand that has guided us, the mercy that has followed us. We praise Thee for the progress we have made in knowledge and insight, for the truth we have learned, for the work we have done, for the prospect that has opened before us of greater attainments yet to come. Thine, O Lord, be all the glory.

If it please Thee, bring us back to this place, O Lord, and cause us again to taste the joys of companionship and the triumphs of faithful perseverance in the pursuit of intellectual and spiritual good.

And if we should be called to work elsewhere, grant us

grace to be always worthy of our University and mindful of her good.

Almighty God, who hast bidden us by Thy holy Apostle not to be conformed to this world but to seek those things which are above and to have our citizenship in heaven, give us grace, we beseech Thee, so to open the doors of our hearts and minds that the tidings Thou art ever sending to us of the pure light and love where Thou dost dwell, may freely come to us, that our treasure may be in heaven and that we may set our faces steadfastly towards Thy Kingdom.

Have mercy on us and on all who have set their trust in Thee, and account us worthy to praise in thankfulness Thy blessed name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. AMEN.

"As well the singers as the players on instruments shall say,
All my fountains are in Thee." PSALM lxxxvii. 7.

IN Thee! In whom then? Who and what is it that is addressed in this verse which sums up the Psalm and tells what is to be the theme of the music, vocal and instrumental, that is to be performed at the festival? It is Zion, the City of God, that is addressed; Zion as the birthplace of their soul for men of different nations, of many lands. It was to Zion that Jewish patriotism thus addressed itself, the place where the great God was known and came down to meet with men, who called all men to worship him. It is not the pleasant country districts of Palestine, its gardens and vineyards, its milk and honey: no, it is the bare rock at Jerusalem where the temple stood.

And that was right. It was right that Mount Zion and what went on there should be celebrated as far the best

treasure Israel possessed, and that it should be said that God loved the Gates of Zion better than all the dwellings of Jacob. The revelation through Israel of the true God who had His seat on Zion was of importance for all the lands and for each succeeding generation. The country districts of Palestine might be pleasant enough ; the Song of Solomon tells us of them and many a story and parable of the Old Testament and the New Testament summon them before us. But it was in Zion that the great God was known who was and is the confidence of all them that are in the earth and go down to the sea. It was fit that the musicians in the festival should say and should feel it, each in his heart, 'All my springs are in Thee.'

That was their patriotism ; it must also be part of ours, if our patriotism is to dwell at peace with our religion and is not to hurry us away to wild and heathenish excesses both of feeling and of language. It will do us good to remember, in this time of excitement and anxiety, that our springs are not in England or Scotland only, but in the religion that shone forth from Zion and received its full embodiment in our Lord Jesus Christ. I will put it more plainly, and say that there are of necessity two patriotisms for us Christians in this age ; there is, first, loyalty to our earthly country, and, second, to our country above, which is the mother not of our nation only, but of all nations.

As to the first kind of patriotism there is no need to say much. Nature itself sees to it that we should love the land that gave us birth, even although we think she has not done for us what she ought. There is little about patriotism pure and simple in the Bible ; there patriotism is always connected with religion ; it is for God the tribes are summoned to fight ; His spirit fills the warrior with courage. And the Christian of the New Testament has

no country on this earth—his citizenship is in Heaven, he is seeking a better, a heavenly country. Neither Catechism nor Confession says anything of the debt we owe to our country.

Yet God has implanted in us this sentiment; we cannot trace the beginning of it in our breast, nor say from what quarter it has come to us. Does it come from the beauty of our glens and of our mountains? But the town-dweller has it too, though he never saw those wonders. Does it come to us from the splendours of our literature as we reflect that the great writers and singers were men of our race, that we are their kinsmen? But the illiterate also may be a patriot. This inborn sentiment is one we scarcely can account for, yet we all have it, and we all pity the person who has lost it or has sold it and would act in defiance of it. Poor lost soul, we say, with no love of his country in his heart!

That sentiment is given to us by nature. It may burn in our breast now more strongly, now less; but however we are tempted to think that our country is a small thing, that the men of all countries are alike, that we belong to Europe, to the world, rather than to England or Scotland, yet our country is able to draw our hearts back to herself again, and to make us say, 'All my springs are in Thee.' Especially when she is threatened or assailed, the thousand ties that bind us to her assert their force again. Her natural beauty, the figures of her heroes in history, the characteristic persons we have known in her, her music and her song come like a flood over our heart. What can we do for her? we ask.

Robert Burns, when he felt the genius that stirred in him, made it his ambition that he would sing a song at least for the sake of Scotland. That can only be done by

one in a million, in many millions ; yet we would fain do what we can. Happy those who are not too old to strike a blow for her, who are able to give themselves, if it be God's will, to give their life, that those who would enslave her may never be able to reach her shores! And those who must perforce remain at home, their hearts, too, are in the great enterprise ; they, too, will do what they can that the land in which are all their springs may be unharmed and free.

We spoke of another power to which our allegiance is due, besides that of our earthly country. It is the power of God before whom each of us stands, to whom each of us is directly responsible for his acts. He is the Maker and Lawgiver and Judge of all nations and all men, and calls upon all to regard Him as supreme and to direct all their actions to His glory. It is our part to keep His commandments and to seek to further His designs so far as we can understand them. In this lies our highest dignity, our greatest freedom, our true happiness, if, placing ourselves under that authority, which is greater than that of any State, of any Church or any earthly power, we claim to be servants of the Most High and enrol in His army. Then we no longer think of the loyalty we owe to our country on earth ; we do from the heart all it requires of us because we know that God made us citizens of our earthly country, and would have us be good and loyal citizens of it.

Does God forbid us to make war? We may say very confidently that He does not, nay, that He knows war to be an evil, certainly, but a necessary evil, if wrongs are to be righted in this world, and arrogance and cruelty to be restrained. A police force is kept in every country to control excesses and protect those who cannot defend them-

selves; and the nations of the world must act at times as God's police force, to vindicate the rights of the weak and curb the pride of the powerful.

With the world arranged as it now is, this is a duty which cannot be shirked; the love of country, when lawlessness is using all its engines and may soon, unless we arm, attempt the enslavement of our country also—the love of our country unites with our fear of God and our desire to see His will prevail, to convince us of the necessity of war, with all the sufferings it brings, all the dreadful sacrifices which attend it.

In what spirit is war to be waged, if it is taken up at God's behest, as a means to make His will prevail upon the earth?

With determination certainly, since it is done at the bidding of a higher power whom there is no gainsaying. We must be determined to succeed, to make all needful sacrifices, and those who cannot go themselves must ask themselves what they can do, and do it cheerfully and promptly.

As far as possible we must leave the motives of hatred and revenge and greed quite apart from our war. Our troops are encouraged by their officers to bear themselves as gentlemen as well as heroes, and are answering nobly to the exhortation. Let us follow their example; let us not look for gain as the fruit of this war, but only for freedom; let us not take delight in ugly stories about our opponents; let us try to keep our heads above the clouds of hatred. Let us go on using the books and the discoveries the Germans have given us, and look forward to the time when we shall again be marching with them in the fields of science.

And let us look forward to the issue with cheerful con-

fidence, such as our troops are showing (God bless them!), and commit our ways to the Lord, not fretting because of the evil-doer. He will not slumber, He will not suffer our foot to be moved.

We are at the close of this term. May God keep in His grace those of you who are going to prepare yourselves to take part in the war, and bring you back ere long, crowned with the victor's wreath, to the country whose liberty you have defended.

GLASGOW: PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS BY ROBERT MACLEHOSE AND CO. LTD.

00067306

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 11 March, 2020